DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 025 579 UD 007 678

By-McNamara, Robert J.; Kamen, Charles S.

Characteristics of Neighborhood Youth Corps In-School Projects: An Analysis for the Year 1966-67.

Chicago Univ., Ill. National Opinion Research Center.

Spons Agency-Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.

Report No-NORC-512-4

Pub Date Apr 67

Note-126p.

EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$6.40

Descriptors-Demography, *Disadvantaged Youth, *Federal Programs, Financial Support, *Guidance Counseling, High School Students, Job Satisfaction, National Programs, *Recruitment, Rural Areas, Statistical Data, Student Characteristics, Student Enrollment, Supervisory Activities, Tables (Data), Urban Areas, *Work Study Programs

Identifiers-Neighborhood Youth Corps, NYC

This study of the Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC) was prepared for the national office describing the in-school programs funded and in operation for the 1967-68 academic year. It was based on responses from 1257 project officials representing an enrollment of 102,468 youths. There were 490 urban projects, 703 rural projects, and 64 "mixed projects." General project characteristics for the country as a whole, as well as for each region, were analyzed in terms of population type, program size, varieties of employment stations, and enrollees' descriptions. It was found that most differences among projects existed, not because of regional location, but rather due to size and type. In general, large urban programs assigned participants more effectively to "white collar" jobs, provided more direct and frequent supervision between staff members and enrollees, and offered more counseling service. Also, the larger the project the more adequate was the funding for a variety of activities. However, 72% of all sponsors reported that there were more students eligible for the Neighborhood Youth Corps than their budgets allowed. The most important success factor in the program, according to 86% of the respondents, was the simple placement of a youth in a job for which he received wages. Job satisfaction and counseling also contributed to the enrollee's sense of achievement. (RB)

07678 E

CHARACTERISTICS OF NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS IN-SCHOOL PROJECTS: AN ANALYSIS FOR THE YEAR 1966-67

By Robert J. McNamara and Charles S. Kamen

National Opinion Research Center
University of Chicago

April, 1967

ED025579

UD 007 678

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

NORC 512
Report #4

ED025579

UD 007 678

CHARACTERISTICS OF NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS IN-SCHOOL PROJECTS: AN ANALYSIS FOR THE YEAR 1966-67

by

Robert J. McNamara
Charles S. Kamen

Under U.S. Department of Labor
Contract Number 66-00-10

National Opinion Research Center
University of Chicago
April, 1967

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES i

Chapter

I PURPOSE AND METHOD 1

II REGIONAL CHARACTERISTICS 3

III THE PROJECT TYPE INDEX 22

IV RECRUITMENT OF ENROLLEES 33

V COUNSELING AND GUIDANCE 42

VI FUNDING 57

VII SUPERVISION AND WORK LOAD 65

VIII PROJECT DIRECTORS' OPINIONS: ENROLLEE SUCCESS AND NYC'S EFFECT ON THE SCHOOLS 76

IX CONCLUSION 91

APPENDIX A - TABLES

APPENDIX B - SPONSORS' FORMS

APPENDIX C - THE QUESTIONNAIRE

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

2.1 Region and Sponsorship 4

2.2 Region and Population Type 6

2.3 Enrollees, Region, and Population Type 7

2.4 Region and Size of Projects 8

2.5 Region and Job Classification 10

2.6 Region and Work Station 12

2.7 Region and Grade in School 13

2.8 Region and Short Work Week 16

2.9 Region and Maximum Legal Time 17

2.10 Region and Ten to Fourteen Hour Work Week 18

2.11 Region and Race 20

2.12 Region and Sex 21

3.1 County and Project Size 24

3.2 Project Type Index 25

3.3 Project Type and Region 26

3.4 Project Type and Whether Agency Ran a Project Last Year 28

3.5 Project Type and Grade in School 29

3.6 Project Type and Job Classification 30

3.7 Project Type and Work Station 31

4.1 Project Type and Type of Recruitment of Enrollees . . 34

4.2 Project Type and Source of Enrollees: Personal Recruitment 36

LIST OF TABLES--Continued

Table — Page

4.3 Project Type and Source of Enrollees: Less Personal Recruitment 37

4.4 Mean Rank-Order of Importance of Sources of Enrollees 38

4.5 Project Type and Enrollment as a Result of Friends . . 40

4.6 Project Type and Recruitment 41

5.1 Guidance Score 44

5.2 Project Type and Guidance Score 45

5.3 Project Type and Availability of Counseling and Testing 46

5.4 Project Type and Number of Different Types of Counseling or Testing 48

5.5 Project Type and Kinds of Counseling Available to NYC Enrollees 49

5.6 Project Type and Termination of Interviews for Enrollees 52

5.7 Project Type and Information about Enrollee's Future Plans 53

5.8 Project Type and Employment Help for Graduating Enrollees 54

6.1 Project Type and How Enrollees are Paid 58

6.2 Project Type and Source of Funds 60

6.3 Project Type and Funding Adequacy 62

6.4 Project Type and Budget Adequacy 63

7.1 Project Type and Mean Number of Work-Station Supervisors 66

7.2 Project Type and Span of Supervisory Control 67

7.3 Project Type and Project Director Also Directs Out-of-School Program 68

LIST OF TABLES--Continued

Table Page

7.4 Project Type and Frequency of Director's Personal Contact with Work-Station Supervisor . . . 70

7.5 Project Type and Frequency of Work-Station Visits by Director and Staff 71

7.6 Project Type and Whether the Enrollees Supervised are Recruited by the Supervisor 73

7.7 Project Type and Enrollee Work Load 75

8.1 Project Type and Importance of Supervisor-Enrollee Ratio for Success 77

8.2 Project Type and Importance of Job Type to Success . . 79

8.3 Opinion of Project Directors on the Relationship Between Job Classification and Enrollee Success . . 80

8.4 Adjusted Opinions of Project Directors on Relationship Between Job Classification and Enrollee Success 81

8.5 Project Type, Job Classification, and Enrollee Success 83

8.6 Mean Ranking of Supervisor-Enrollee Ratio, Type of Job Assignment, and the Fact of Having a Job and Some Counseling as Factors Contributing to Enrollee Success 85

8.7 Project Type and Changes in School Because of NYC . . 87

8.8 Effect of NYC on School Counseling Services 89

CHAPTER I

PURPOSE AND METHOD

The purpose of the report is to present the Neighborhood Youth Corps' (NYC) national office with specific information about the in-school programs funded and in operation for the 1967-68 academic year. The questionnaire on which it is based (cf. Appendix C for NORC Questionnaire 512-S) served not only to elicit this information but to secure actual 1967 enrollment figures which could be used to draw a national sample of NYC enrollees for a panel study of enrollees' educational and occupational values.

The information about programs which NYC officials and the NORC staff considered appropriate for NYC's purposes came under five headings:

(1) Recruiting Methods: How do the local programs actually enlist enrollees? How do they contact impoverished youngsters? Do they find a smaller or larger number of such youngsters than are provided for by their budgets? Do they find that the youngsters have other problems besides poverty to contend with?

(2) Counseling and Guidance: Can the programs actually provide the counseling and guidance which the NYC enrollees need? Can the programs rely on the school systems to provide these services?

(3) Program Finances: How adequate are budgets for the services which the programs should provide? Are enrollee wage rates sufficiently high to accomplish what the program must do--i.e., help impoverished youth remain in school until graduation--if it is to succeed in terms of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964?

(4) Supervisory Staff: How do project directors obtain supervisors? What kind of contact do project directors maintain with work station supervisors and enrollees? What are normal supervisor-enrollee ratios?

(5) Opinion of Project Directors on Program Success: Since project directors are in contact with the local programs, what are their opinions about factors important for a successful program? How do they see NYC affecting the schools?

To obtain answers to these questions, we drew up a questionnaire and sent it to all project directors across the country. Addresses were secured from NYC's Washington office from lists of approved and pending projects for fiscal 1967 as well as from the 1966 project lists. These addresses were checked, and more were secured, by sending an information form (cf. Appendix B) to the 1,119 probable program sponsors on the NYC Washington lists. Of these, 1,043 (94 per cent) returned the forms; 265 declared they were not running in-school programs in the fall of 1967. The remaining 788 sponsors supplied us with 1,838 addresses for themselves and their subsponsors, together with the name and position of the responsible official to whom the Sponsors' Questionnaire (NORC 512-S) was to be sent.

Official clearance from the Bureau of the Budget was communicated to NORC on December 1, 1966. On December 8 and 9, the questionnaires were mailed out to the 1,838 responsible officials. By the end of the first week in January, 1,079 questionnaires had been returned, and a second wave of questionnaires brought 458 additional returns for our cutoff date of February 8, 1967. Thus the total number of returns was 1,537, for a response rate of 83 per cent.

Of these 1,537 questionnaires, 117 were from "dropouts"--i.e., agencies reporting no program for 1967; 53 were "cover" questionnaires--i.e., were returned by "umbrella" sponsors who were not actually running programs themselves and whose subsponsors returned questionnaires; 110 were either unidentifiable (usually from small rural areas) or did not consider themselves competent to answer the questions. Consequently, the total number of cases on which this report is based is 1,257. The total number of youngsters whom these projects were authorized to enroll was 106,315. The actual number they report as enrolling is 102,468. These projects represent as close an approximation of the universe of projects ongoing in the fall of 1967 as was possible under the circumstances.

CHAPTER II

REGIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

This chapter presents general project characteristics for the country as a whole as well as for each region, so that problems and patterns specific to one or another region may be seen clearly. The general characteristics with which we are concerned are: (1) population type--rural vs. urban; (2) project size; (3) job classification; (4) type of work station; (5) enrollees' school grade level; (6) length of work week; (7) race; and (8) sex.

The first series of tables (2.1 - 2.4) present data concerning demographic and administrative characteristics of the projects. Our decision to get questionnaires into the hands of the people who are actually running ongoing NYC projects, instead of being satisfied with "umbrella" sponsors who only serve as administrative channels for these projects, was an important factor in determining the distributions presented in these tables.

All the project directors on whose questionnaires this report is based said that they were actually running projects in the fall of 1967. Six hundred and ninety-four of them (55 per cent) were "subsponsors"--i.e., not the primary contractors for their own projects; 563 (45 per cent) were "sponsors"--i.e., primary contractors. Some among the sponsors had subsponsors, or at least work sites for which they delegated day-by-day responsibility to a person who became--to that extent, if not technically--a subsponsor; others did not. When the subsponsor had a fairly large number of enrollees entrusted to him, or when he was geographically so separated from the sponsor that face-to-face communication and close supervision became impossible, the subsponsors normally returned their own questionnaires. In this way the goal of getting on-the-spot project directors or their delegates to fill out the questionnaire was achieved.

Table 2.1 presents the distribution of sponsors and subsponsors in this real if not technical sense. A very small number of cases--no

TABLE 2.1

REGION AND SPONSORSHIP

(Distribution of Projects According to Region and Type of Sponsor: Per Cent)

Type of Sponsor	Region							Total U.S.
	NE*	MA	SE	MW	SW	MP	FW	
Sponsor . .	45.8	91.5	81.6	28.2	24.4	84.1	31.1	44.8
Sub-Sponsor	54.2	8.5	18.4	71.8	75.6	15.9	68.9	55.2
Total .	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N) . . .	(236)	(115)	(76)	(209)	(324)	(107)	(190)	(1,257)

*On this and the following regional tables, the abbreviations are as follows: NE (Northeast, Region I): New England, New Jersey, New York, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands; MA (Middle Atlantic, Region II): Delaware, D.C., Kentucky, Maryland, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, the Virginias; SE (Southeast, Region III): Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, Tennessee; MW (Midwest, Region IV): Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin; SW (Southwest, Region V): Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas; MP (Mountain Plains, Region VI): Colorado, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, the Dakotas, Utah, Wyoming; FW (Far West, Region VII): Alaska, Arizona, California, Guam, Hawaii, Nevada, Oregon, Washington.

more than half a dozen--may have escaped our net; but we can say that all or virtually all of the cases listed as sponsors actually run programs--sometimes quite large if in metropolitan areas--whether or not they have subsponsors.

Table 2.1 shows that the Midwest (Region IV) and Southwest (Region V) have the highest proportions of subsponsors. These two regions have many rural areas with geographically separated projects. The Northeast and Far West (Regions I and VII) also have a relatively high proportion of subsponsors, mainly because school systems and other organizations in high density population areas are frequently funded under a municipal or community action program acting as an "umbrella" sponsor. The proportionately small number of subsponsors in the other three regions is due both to contract administration and the closer connection between sponsor and agents who in the Midwest and Southwest might have been classified as subsponsors.

Tables 2.2 and 2.3 present a familiar demographic pattern. While 56 per cent of the projects are situated in counties which are classified as rural by the Bureau of the Census, the rural projects enroll only 37,163 youngsters (36 per cent); urban projects enroll 62,036 or 61 per cent. Again, the Midwest and Southwest have fewest urban projects (even though the Midwest has more urban than rural enrollees), followed closely by the Middle Atlantic and the Southeast.

Table 2.4 points again to the high number of respondents from small projects in the Midwest and Southwest, for more than half of them are running projects enrolling less than ten enrollees. This is the exact opposite of the pattern in the Middle Atlantic and Southeast regions.

Discrepancies like these among projects indicate clearly that project size and the urban-rural division must be carefully watched in the analysis of project characteristics which begins in Chapter III and continues through to the end of this report. We shall use these two "independent variables" again and again in our tables. Chapter III will explain the way in which we have combined them to form the Project Type Index.

TABLE 2.2

REGION AND POPULATION TYPE

(Distribution of Projects According to Region and Population: Per Cent)

Population Type	Region							Total U.S.
	NE	MA	SE	MW	SW	MP	FW	
Urban . . .	57.2	32.1	31.5	31.1	14.8	51.4	66.3	38.9
Rural . . .	16.1	67.8	68.4	68.8	85.1	48.5	33.1	55.9
Mixed . . .	26.6	00.0	00.0	00.0	00.0	00.0	.5	5.0
Total . .	99.9	99.9	99.9	99.9	99.9	99.9	99.9	99.8
(N) . . .	236	115	76	209	324	107	190	1,257

TABLE 2.3

ENROLLEES, REGION, AND POPULATION TYPE

(Distribution of Enrollees According to Region and Population Type: Whole Numbers)

Region	Population Type			Total
	Urban	Rural	Mixed	
NE	11,206	1,790	2,958	15,954
MA	8,014	8,729	--	16,743
SE	7,882	10,345	--	18,227
MW	14,316	3,395	--	17,711
SW	5,933	9,171	--	15,104
MP	3,546	2,058	--	5,604
FW	11,139	1,675	311	13,125
Total . .	62,036	37,163	3,269	102,468

TABLE 2.4

REGION AND SIZE OF PROJECTS

(Distribution of Projects According to Region and Number of Actual Enrollees per Project: Per Cent)

Number of Enrollees	Region							Total U.S.
	NE	MA	SE	MW	SW	MP	FW	
1-4 . . .	5.5	.8	1.3	50.7	28.0	6.5	18.9	20.2
5-9 . . .	23.3	0.0	0.0	13.3	28.0	9.3	14.2	16.7
10-19 . .	19.4	2.6	1.3	6.6	12.6	11.2	21.5	12.5
20-49 . .	22.0	7.8	6.5	1.9	8.9	33.6	24.7	14.4
50-99 . .	15.2	33.0	3.9	10.5	4.9	28.9	7.3	12.7
100-299 . .	11.3	48.6	61.7	8.5	14.1	9.3	7.8	17.3
300-599 . .	1.6	4.3	18.4	6.2	3.0	.9	4.2	4.3
600 + . . .	1.2	2.6	6.5	1.9	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.3
Total. .	99.5	99.7	99.6	99.6	99.5	99.7	99.6	99.4
(N) . .	236	115	76	209	324	107	190	1,257

Tables 2.5, 2.6, and 2.7 present a somewhat complicated series of classifications. For the entire country, and for each region, these tables show the proportion of projects which have certain percentages of enrollees in each job category (Table 2.5), in each type of work station (Table 2.6), and in each grade of high school (Table 2.7). Thus, taking the last column of Table 2.5, the table shows that 46.9 per cent of all the projects in the country have no enrollees working as academic aides in secondary schools, that 11.4 per cent have from 1 to 9 per cent there, etc., up to the last figure which indicates that 3 per cent of all projects have half or more of their enrollees working as academic aides in secondary schools. These tables omit the question of project size; it is possible that a small project in which all or nearly all enrollees work as academic aides, for instance, could actually have less such aides than a large project which reports that 10 or 20 per cent of its enrollees work as academic aides. What these tables bring out are administrative divisions according to region; project size, an important analytic variable, will be handled in subsequent chapters.

Table 2.5 points to the following regional similarities and differences:

(1) The Northeast, Mountain Plains, and the Far West tend to resemble each other in the proportions of projects allocating similar percentages of their enrollees to each job classification; the Midwest and Southwest form another pattern; and the Middle Atlantic and Southeast form a third pattern;

(2) The Midwest and Southwest have least heterogeneity within their programs, or within independent units of their programs, for they consistently have percentages in the "none" category which are higher than the national average; judging by the same standard, the Middle Atlantic and Southeast seem to have most program heterogeneity and the Northeast, Mountain Plains and Far West are in the middle;

TABLE 2.5

REGION AND JOB CLASSIFICATION

(Distribution of Projects According to Region and Proportion of Enrollees in Each Job Classification: Per Cent)

Job Classification	Percentage of Enrollees in Classification	Region							Total U.S.
		NE	MA	SE	MW	SW	MP	FW	
Academic Aides in Secondary Schools	None . . .	34.7	12.1	3.9	67.9	66.3	40.1	47.8	46.9
	1-9 % . . .	16.1	17.3	10.5	4.3	10.8	10.2	12.1	11.4
	10-19% . . .	22.4	27.8	28.9	10.0	10.1	14.9	12.6	15.9
	20-29% . . .	15.6	23.4	31.5	5.7	6.4	12.1	13.6	12.7
	30-49% . . .	8.3	13.0	22.2	8.0	4.5	19.5	9.3	9.7
	50% + . . .	2.5	6.0	2.6	3.7	1.5	2.8	4.2	3.0
	Total . . .	99.6	99.6	99.6	99.6	99.6	99.6	99.6	99.6
	(N).	(236)	(115)	(76)	(209)	(324)	(107)	(190)	(1,257)
Office Aides Regardless of Work Site	None . . .	13.5	6.0	2.6	36.8	40.7	19.6	18.9	24.4
	1-9 % . . .	3.8	20.0	30.2	3.3	6.4	13.0	4.2	8.3
	10-19% . . .	23.3	43.4	44.7	14.8	23.4	23.3	14.2	23.7
	20-29% . . .	25.4	21.7	19.7	14.3	18.8	22.4	31.0	21.7
	30-49% . . .	22.3	8.6	1.3	12.4	7.3	18.6	24.1	14.2
	50% + . . .	11.3	0.0	1.3	18.1	3.0	2.8	7.2	7.3
	Total . . .	99.6	99.7	99.8	99.7	99.6	99.7	99.6	99.6
	(N).	(236)	(115)	(76)	(209)	(324)	(107)	(190)	(1,257)
Aides in Special Academic Programs	None . . .	75.8	70.4	68.4	85.6	91.3	78.5	79.4	81.3
	1-9 % . . .	13.9	21.7	26.3	10.5	4.3	11.2	14.2	12.1
	10-19% . . .	7.6	6.0	5.2	2.8	2.4	9.3	3.6	4.7
	20% + . . .	2.4	1.7	0.0	.9	1.8	.9	2.6	1.6
	Total . . .	99.7	99.8	99.9	99.8	99.8	99.9	99.8	99.7
	(N).	(236)	(115)	(76)	(209)	(324)	(107)	(190)	(1,257)
Library Aides	None . . .	25.4	8.6	7.8	53.5	53.0	31.7	35.2	36.6
	1-9 % . . .	27.1	46.9	53.9	21.0	20.0	31.7	25.2	27.8
	10-19% . . .	31.7	35.6	35.5	11.0	13.8	24.2	21.5	22.1
	20% + . . .	15.2	8.6	2.6	14.1	12.7	12.0	17.9	13.0
	Total . . .	99.7	99.7	99.8	99.6	99.5	99.6	99.8	99.5
	(N)	(236)	(115)	(76)	(209)	(324)	(107)	(190)	(1,257)

TABLE 2.5 (Continued)

Job Classification	Percentage of Enrollees in Classification	Region							Total U.S.
		NE	MA	SE	MW	SW	MP	FW	
Hospital Aides	None . . .	72.0	79.1	68.4	84.2	90.7	75.7	82.6	81.2
	1-19% . . .	21.5	19.1	30.2	12.8	7.6	20.4	14.6	11.5
	20% + . . .	6.2	1.6	1.3	2.6	1.5	3.6	2.5	6.8
	Total . . .	99.7	99.8	99.9	99.6	99.8	99.7	99.7	99.5
	(N) . . .	(236)	(115)	(76)	(209)	(324)	(107)	(190)	(1,257)
Service Aides	None . . .	44.9	20.0	11.8	64.1	59.5	44.8	55.2	49.1
	1-9 % . . .	25.0	20.8	39.4	10.5	9.2	26.1	18.4	18.1
	10-19% . . .	17.3	37.3	32.8	11.0	13.2	19.6	16.3	18.0
	20% + . . .	12.5	21.6	15.7	14.1	17.7	9.1	9.8	14.4
	Total . . .	99.7	99.7	99.7	99.7	99.6	99.6	99.7	99.6
	(N)	(236)	(115)	(76)	(209)	(324)	(107)	(190)	(1,257)
Aides for Unskilled Work	None . . .	14.4	4.3	3.9	18.6	8.9	8.4	12.6	11.3
	1-19% . . .	27.4	27.7	21.0	8.5	4.6	19.5	14.6	15.4
	20-29% . . .	19.0	22.6	25.0	14.3	8.6	18.6	19.4	16.3
	30-49% . . .	17.3	36.4	27.5	13.8	14.4	25.1	24.6	20.1
	50-99% . . .	18.6	8.6	22.3	32.5	45.0	23.3	22.1	28.0
	100%	2.9	0.0	0.0	11.9	18.2	4.6	6.3	8.5
	Total . . .	99.6	99.6	99.7	99.6	99.7	99.5	99.6	99.6
	(N)	(236)	(115)	(76)	(209)	(324)	(107)	(190)	(1,257)
Aides for Semi-skilled or Skilled Work	None . . .	61.4	46.0	39.4	79.9	75.0	64.4	68.4	66.5
	1-9 % . . .	19.0	29.5	40.7	9.5	9.5	18.6	15.2	16.7
	10-19% . . .	11.0	14.7	14.4	5.2	6.7	6.5	10.5	9.0
	20% + . . .	8.2	9.3	5.2	5.0	8.4	10.1	5.6	7.4
	Total . . .	99.6	99.5	99.7	99.6	99.6	99.7	99.7	99.6
	(N)	(236)	(115)	(76)	(209)	(324)	(107)	(190)	(1,257)

TABLE 2.6

REGION AND WORK STATION

(Distribution of Projects According to Region and Proportion of Enrollees Employed at Each Type of Work Station: Per Cent)

Type of Work Station	Percentage of Enrollees in Each Type	Region							Total U.S.
		NE	MA	SE	MW	SW	MP	FW	
Public Schools	None . . .	8.4	7.8	5.2	13.8	7.4	10.2	11.0	9.3
	1-79% . . .	35.4	23.4	11.8	13.6	7.9	28.8	20.4	19.2
	80-99% . . .	11.0	25.2	32.8	11.0	9.5	16.8	11.0	13.7
	100%	44.9	43.4	50.0	61.2	75.0	43.9	57.3	57.3
	Total . .	99.7	99.8	99.8	99.6	99.8	99.7	99.7	99.5
	(N)	(236)	(115)	(76)	(209)	(324)	(107)	(190)	(1,257)
Religiously Affiliated Schools	None . . .	81.3	87.8	96.0	85.1	93.8	82.2	92.1	88.3
	1-99% . . .	18.4	11.9	3.9	12.3	5.4	16.6	7.7	10.5
	100% . . .	.4	.8	0.0	2.3	.6	.9	0.0	.7
	Total . .	100.1	100.5	99.9	99.7	99.8	99.7	99.8	99.5
	(N) . . .	(236)	(115)	(76)	(209)	(324)	(107)	(190)	(1,257)
Private, Non-Profit Agencies	None . . .	63.1	78.2	76.3	87.0	94.4	82.2	82.6	81.9
	1-19% . . .	18.5	19.0	23.6	9.0	3.6	12.0	13.6	12.2
	20% . . .	18.0	2.5	0.0	3.7	1.8	5.5	3.5	5.7
	Total . .	99.6	99.7	99.9	99.7	99.8	99.7	99.7	99.8
	(N)	(236)	(115)	(76)	(209)	(324)	(107)	(190)	(1,257)
County, State or Municipal Agencies	None . . .	62.7	60.0	61.8	77.9	86.1	65.4	71.0	72.4
	1-19% . . .	19.4	32.1	32.8	9.5	9.4	19.5	16.2	16.6
	20%	17.6	7.7	5.2	12.3	4.2	14.8	12.5	10.5
	Total . .	99.7	99.8	99.8	99.7	99.7	99.7	99.7	99.5
	(N) . . .	(236)	(115)	(76)	(209)	(324)	(107)	(190)	(1,257)

TABLE 2.7

REGION AND GRADE IN SCHOOL

(Distribution of Projects According to Region and Proportion of Enrollees in Tenth, Eleventh, and Twelfth Grade: Per Cent)

Grade in School	Percentage of Enrollees in Each Grade	Region							Total U.S.
		NE	MA	SE	MW	SW	MP	FW	
Tenth	None . . .	16.9	2.6	5.2	56.9	38.5	21.4	25.2	28.7
	1-9 % . . .	6.3	16.5	13.1	4.7	5.2	17.7	8.9	8.5
	10-19% . . .	27.5	46.0	51.3	12.9	18.8	28.9	26.3	25.9
	20-29% . . .	29.2	28.6	21.0	9.0	21.9	19.6	22.6	21.6
	30% + . . .	19.7	6.0	9.1	16.0	15.1	12.0	16.6	14.8
	Total . . .	99.6	99.7	99.6	99.5	99.5	99.6	99.6	99.5
	(N)	(236)	(115)	(76)	(209)	(324)	(107)	(190)	(1,257)
Eleventh	None . . .	5.0	.8	2.6	26.7	17.2	7.4	11.5	12.4
	1-19% . . .	6.7	5.2	9.2	3.3	7.3	2.8	5.7	5.8
	20-29% . . .	18.6	30.4	28.9	7.6	24.0	14.0	16.8	19.2
	30-39% . . .	29.2	43.4	47.3	24.8	17.2	28.0	22.1	26.6
	40-49% . . .	19.4	16.5	7.8	5.2	12.0	29.9	20.5	15.2
	50% + . . .	20.7	3.4	3.9	31.8	21.7	17.6	23.0	20.3
	Total . . .	99.6	99.7	99.7	99.4	99.4	99.7	99.6	99.5
	(N)	(236)	(115)	(76)	(209)	(324)	(107)	(190)	(1,257)
Twelfth	None . . .	8.8	.8	3.9	11.9	14.1	4.6	10.0	9.5
	1-29% . . .	35.5	24.3	13.0	16.6	18.3	18.5	23.5	22.2
	20-39% . . .	21.6	32.1	43.4	11.0	14.5	14.9	16.8	19.0
	40-49% . . .	14.8	18.2	19.7	9.0	12.9	24.2	17.8	15.2
	50% + . . .	18.9	24.2	19.6	51.1	39.6	37.2	31.4	33.6
	Total . . .	99.6	99.6	99.6	99.6	99.7	99.4	99.5	99.5
	(N)	(236)	(115)	(76)	(209)	(324)	(107)	(190)	(1,257)

(3) The Middle Atlantic and Southeast have a strikingly large proportion of programs in which 20 per cent or more of their enrollees are employed as academic aides; they have a considerably smaller proportion of projects than most other regions in which 20 per cent or more work as office aides;

(4) The Midwest and Southwest have a much higher proportion of projects in which 50 per cent or more of the enrollees are aides for unskilled jobs. ✓

Just how important these differences are is an open question. They may be due to uncontrollable geographic and demographic differences being reflected in administrative procedures. They may or may not be related to enrollee success. The study of the enrollees will help to resolve the question.

Table 2.6 examines the proportions of enrollees working at different types of work stations. Across the nation, 71 per cent of the projects have 80 per cent or more of their enrollees working in public schools. Approximately half of the projects in each region have all their enrollees working in public schools; but three-quarters of the Southwest projects and three-fifths of the Midwest projects have all their enrollees working in public schools. The Northeast stands out as having proportionately more projects with at least some enrollees in other work sites, but the public schools are by far the dominant providers of work stations.

The same sort of similarities and differences among regions appear in Table 2.7, dealing with region and enrollees' grade in school, as appeared in Table 2.5. The Midwest and Southwest tend toward more homogeneous (and smaller) groups in each project; the Middle Atlantic and Southeast show greatest diversification; and the Northeast, Mountain Plains, and Far West are in the middle.

Leaving our discussion of regional patterns for the moment, it may be helpful at this stage to point out what the actual percentages are for the entire country in regard to job classification, work station, and grade in school. (These figures are presented in tabular form in Appendix A).

In spite of the fact more than half of the projects across the country have at least some enrollees working as academic aides in secondary schools, only one-fifth (20.8 per cent) of all enrollees are actually so employed; another fifth are employed as office aides, regardless of work site; the largest group (27.7 per cent) are employed as aides for unskilled manual work. Only 7.2 per cent work as library aides, and a miniscule 2.9 per cent work as aides in special academic programs. Ten per cent work as service aides, and 5 per cent as aides at semi-skilled tasks (cf. Appendix Table A.1).

This large proportion of nonacademic jobs might be unexpected, since 77.8 per cent of the enrollees work in public schools and 4.3 per work in private schools, religiously affiliated or non-sectarian (cf. Appendix Table A.2). What obviously merits study here is: who gets into what job categories and why?

The third Appendix table points to a fact already obvious: 70 per cent of the enrollees are in the 11th or 12th grade, with the 12th grade drawing the single biggest block of enrollees (36 per cent).

Returning to the regional analysis, Table 2.8 shows that a surprisingly high proportion (38.3 per cent) of the projects report that more than 10 per cent of their enrollees work less than ten hours per week; the Middle Atlantic and Southeast regions report an extraordinarily high proportion of such enrollees (57.3 and 86.8 per cent, respectively). Half of the projects across the nation report that all their enrollees work the maximum legal time--and in this the Middle Atlantic and Southeast do not lag so much behind the other regions, although one-third of their projects report that "few or none" of their enrollees work the maximum legal time, a figure somewhat higher than those for other regions (Table 2.9).

Again, Table 2.10 shows that these same two regions are well behind the others in the proportions of their enrollees working for from ten to fourteen hours per week.

TABLE 2.8

REGION AND SHORT WORK WEEK

(Distribution of Projects According to Region and Proportion in which More than Ten Per Cent of Enrollees Work Less than Ten Hours per Week: Per Cent)

More than Ten Per Cent Work Less than Ten Hours Per Week?	Region							Total U.S.
	NE	MA	SE	MW	SW	MP	FW	
Yes	34.8	57.3	86.8	29.8	30.9	36.7	33.8	38.3
No	65.1	42.6	13.1	70.1	69.0	63.2	66.1	61.6
Total . . .	99.9	99.9	99.9	99.9	99.9	99.9	99.9	99.9
N	235	115	76	201	320	106	189	1,242
NA	1	0	0	8	4	1	1	15
Total	236	115	76	209	324	107	190	1,257

TABLE 2.9

REGION AND MAXIMUM LEGAL TIME

(Distribution of Projects According to Region and Proportions of Enrollees within Projects Who Work Maximum Legal Time: Per Cent)

Proportions of Enrollees Who Work Maximum	Region							Total U.S.
	NE	MA	SE	MW	SW	MP	FW	
All	41.6	38.0	42.1	53.1	64.2	36.7	46.7	49.3
Three-fourths . . .	21.8	14.1	19.7	9.7	5.0	18.8	19.3	14.0
About Half	13.1	8.7	6.5	14.5	4.2	14.9	17.0	11.1
One-Fourth	6.0	2.6	1.3	5.3	1.8	4.7	5.9	4.1
Few or None	17.1	36.2	30.2	17.0	24.3	24.5	10.7	21.2
Total	99.6	99.6	99.8	99.6	99.5	99.6	99.6	99.7
N	233	113	76	205	316	106	186	1,235
NA	3	2	0	4	8	1	4	22
Total	236	115	76	209	324	107	190	1,257

TABLE 2.10

REGION AND TEN TO FOURTEEN HOUR WORK WEEK

(Distribution of Projects According to Region and Proportions of Enrollees Within Projects Who Work from Ten to Fourteen Hours per Week: Per Cent)

Proportions of Enrollees Who Work 10-14 Hours	Region							Total U.S.
	NE	MA	SE	MW	SW	MP	FW	
All	44.8	30.7	4.0	50.0	49.3	44.7	43.7	42.9
Three-fourths . . .	16.6	10.5	0.0	8.3	4.7	13.3	15.6	10.2
About half	11.9	7.8	4.0	12.7	2.4	14.2	9.1	8.4
One-fourth	8.5	5.2	2.7	2.4	3.4	4.7	7.0	5.0
Few or none	17.9	45.6	89.1	26.4	39.8	22.8	24.3	33.1
Total	99.7	99.8	99.8	99.8	99.6	99.7	99.7	99.6
N	234	114	74	204	316	105	185	1,232
NA	2	1	2	5	8	2	5	25
Total	236	115	76	209	324	107	190	1,257

When they were asked why so many of their enrollees worked less than ten hours per week, 64 per cent of the sixty-four Middle Atlantic directors replied it was because of their contract, as did 82 per cent of the fifty-eight respondents from the Southeast, and 62 per cent of the seventy-eight from the Southwest. Very few respondents from other regions gave this answer. Again, when the directors were asked why youngsters worked from ten to fourteen hours per week, but not fifteen, 70 per cent or better of those who responded from every region stated that it was due to their NYC contract. Almost none gave any other reason--e.g., transportation difficulties, insufficient work, too few supervisors, the demands of study or school activities on the enrollee, or apathetic enrollees.

Certainly, then, the project directors see contract limitations or administrative budgeting procedures as the reason for a less-than-fifteen hour work week for the enrollees.

The final two tables in this chapter deal with two program characteristics which are everywhere present where human beings are present: race and sex. Rather than ask for actual numbers of white and non-white enrollees--which a good number or projects refuse to report--we asked them whether all or most or half, etc., of their enrollees were white. No project seems legally or otherwise bound to refuse to answer that question. The results are presented in Table 2.11. Just about 40 per cent of all projects report an all-white membership, and only 6.5 per cent report all or nearly all non-white membership. Just less than one-quarter (23.8 per cent) report that less than half of their projects have a majority of non-white members. The regional groupings follow expected demographic characteristics.

This is an intriguing finding, since we know that 40 per cent of all enrollees up until the summer of 1966 were Negro. (Cf. our report of January, 1967 to NYC entitled Characteristics of Neighborhood Youth Corps In-School Enrollees from Program Inception Until September 1, 1966.) The answer doubtless lies in the fact that most Negroes are in large urban programs, and so are underrepresented in Table 2.11.

TABLE 2.11

REGION AND RACE

(Distribution of Projects According to Region and Proportions of Enrollees within Projects Who Are White: Per Cent)

Proportions of Enrollees Who Are White	Region							Total U.S
	NE	MA	SE	MW	SW	MP	FW	
All	52.3	14.7	4.0	66.9	35.8	37.1	31.5	39.6
Most	17.1	26.9	8.0	6.3	8.7	17.1	18.7	13.7
Half or a little more	14.1	22.5	42.6	13.0	28.3	26.6	24.0	22.6
Under one-half . .	12.8	30.4	44.0	11.6	16.8	9.5	15.5	17.3
Few or none	3.4	5.2	1.3	1.8	10.2	9.4	10.0	6.5
Total	99.7	99.7	99.9	99.6	99.8	99.7	99.7	99.7
N	233	115	75	206	321	105	187	1,242
NA	3	0	1	3	3	2	3	15
Total	236	115	76	209	324	107	190	1,257

Lastly, the projects were asked what proportion of their enrollees were male, and Table 2.12 presents the results. Inspection of the data reveals that slightly more of the enrollees across the country are reported as being male, but that this proportion is reversed strongly for the Northeast and slightly for the Midwest.

TABLE 2.12

REGION AND SEX

(Distribution of Projects According to Region and Proportions of Enrollees within Projects Who Are Male: Per Cent)

Proportions of Enrollees Who Are Male	Region							Total U.S.
	NE	MA	SE	MW	SW	MP	FW	
Two-thirds or more	20.4	13.8	10.6	28.8	36.7	21.5	29.0	26.2
More than one-half	17.9	23.4	33.3	8.3	22.2	21.6	15.3	18.8
One-half	16.2	29.5	26.6	25.0	21.9	20.7	22.2	22.3
Less than one-half.	24.7	29.5	25.3	13.2	6.8	26.4	17.4	17.7
One-third or less .	20.4	3.4	3.9	24.4	11.9	9.4	15.7	14.6
Total	99.6	99.6	99.7	99.7	99.5	99.6	99.6	99.6
N	234	115	75	204	323	106	189	1,246
NA	2	0	1	5	1	1	1	11
Total	236	115	76	209	324	107	190	1,257

CHAPTER III

THE PROJECT TYPE INDEX

A limited number of general characteristics must pertain to all projects just because the projects exist. These characteristics are the "independent variables": Project size (number of enrollees), location (in an urban county, rural county, or "mixed" area--i.e., serving enrollees from both urban and rural counties), region (described in Chapter II), white-nonwhite ratio among enrollees, the time when the project came into existence (before or after September, 1966), job classification and work station. When a large number of "dependent variables" were cross-tabulated with these independent variables, an interesting pattern emerged. Seemingly diverse things like the amount of counseling offered to the enrollees and the project directors' satisfaction with funding varied in much the same way, on a percentage basis, no matter which single independent variable was involved in the cross-tabulation. This pattern indicated that the independent variables, although conceptually different one from another, were related to one another and could be brought together to form a single analytical index. This possibility was strikingly supported when the independent variables were cross-tabulated; for the cross-tabulation revealed a strong tendency for urban projects to be larger than rural ones, for higher proportions of non-whites to be enrolled in larger and urban projects, for these latter projects to have been in existence before September, 1966, and for these same projects to offer somewhat more diversified job classifications and work stations.

Given these analytic findings, the strategy for further analysis best suited to reveal similarities and differences among different types of programs, and best suited to avoid cluttering the analysis with an unnecessarily large number of variables, became clear: the construction of a sample index of projects using only two independent variables--size and urban vs. rural location--which would produce a manageable and meaningful number of separate analytic cells into which the projects could be divided.

Table 3.1 gives the numerical distribution of projects when they are divided by size and county-type (rural-urban). There are 490 urban projects, 703 rural projects, and only 64 "mixed" projects. Since the latter represent less than 5 per cent of the total, we shall normally not break them down into separate size categories in the tables which follow. In most cases, the characteristics of the mixed projects are quite similar to those of the medium-sized or small projects, as one would expect from their location in Table 3.1.

The next step in the construction of the index was to collapse the nine "size" categories of Table 3.1 into a smaller number of manageable categories. After inspecting various cross-tabulations, we saw that the best way to summarize the data and yet let differences among projects stand out was to collapse the size variable into three categories: "Small" (1 - 9 enrollees); "Medium" (10 - 99 enrollees); and "Large" (100 or more enrollees). The resulting distribution of projects is presented in Table 3.2. This distribution attains the goal of analytic simplicity: nine cells, normally collapsed to seven because of the small number of mixed projects. At the same time, it keeps the number of projects in each cell large enough to generalize about.

Although we presented a picture of regional differences in Chapter II, we did so only because the country has seven administrative regions and because that picture may be valuable for administrative purposes. Most differences among projects are not due to their being in different administrative regions, but are due to project size and county type. To use Region as a basic control variable would be to obscure the reasons for the differences, not to explain them.

Table 3.3 shows the regional distribution of projects according to Project Type. Strong differences occur between Regions due to factors over which the Regions can have very little influence. For instance, within only two Regions are the proportions of small, medium, and large projects the same for urban and rural counties: the Middle Atlantic and

TABLE 3.1

COUNTY AND PROJECT SIZE

(Number of Projects in Each Category)

Size	Urban	Rural	Mixed	Total
1 - 4 . . .	43	212	--	255
5 - 9 . . .	44	138	29	211
10 - 19 . .	59	70	29	158
20 - 49 . .	114	64	4	182
50 - 99 . .	85	75	--	160
100 - 199 . .	54	98	--	152
200 - 299 . .	42	25	--	67
300 - 599 . .	34	20	1	55
600+	15	1	1	17
Total .	490	703	64	1,257

TABLE 3.2

PROJECT TYPE INDEX

(Number of Projects in Each Category)

Size	Urban	Rural	Mixed	Total
Small (1 - 9) . .	87	350	29	466
Medium (10 - 99)	258	209	33	500
Large (100+) . .	145	144	2	291
Total	490	703	64	1,257

TABLE 3.3

PROJECT TYPE AND REGION

(Per Cent of Each Type, by Region)

Project Type	North-east	Mid-Atlantic	South-east	Midwest	South-West	Moun-tain Plains	Far West
Urban:							
Small . .	19.9	--	--	30.7	--	5.4	29.2
Medium .	60.6	43.2	12.5	32.2	49.8	79.8	53.8
Large . .	19.9	56.7	87.5	36.7	49.9	14.4	16.4
(N) . .	(135)	(37)	(24)	(65)	(48)	(55)	(126)
Rural:							
Small . .	31.5	1.2	1.9	79.0	65.8	26.8	41.1
Medium . .	49.9	43.4	11.4	13.0	22.4	67.2	53.8
Large . .	18.4	55.0	86.4	7.4	11.4	5.7	4.6
(N) . .	(38)	(78)	(52)	(144)	(276)	(52)	(63)
Mixed: . . .	(63)	--	--	--	--	--	(1)

Total 1,257

the Southeast. In all others, the proportion of small rural projects far exceeds the proportion of small urban projects; and, for the last four of the seven Regions, the proportion of large urban projects is considerably higher than the proportion of large rural projects.

Table 3.4 shows that project size is strongly related to the question of whether or not the sponsor ran an in-school program before ✓ the 1966-67 school year. Smaller projects, whether urban or rural, were less likely to be sponsored by veterans of at least one year's previous experience; but this was especially true of the smaller urban projects. However, the fact that 66 per cent of all sponsors were veterans argues for growing continuity of sponsorship in a very young federal program.

Table 2.7 showed that the great majority of projects across the nation take more of their enrollees from the eleventh and twelfth grades ✓ than from all other grades. Table 3.5 bears this out, for the mean grade in school for enrollees across the nation is 11.1. It also shows that county location and project size have little effect on this tendency, since the Project Type Index shows that only the large, rural projects have a mean grade level which is below 11.0--and for them it is 10.9.

Tables 3.6 and 3.7 correlate the Project Type Index with job classification and work station. (For an explanation of the job classifications, cf. page 19, q. #51 of Appendix C). Larger projects tend to ✓ have more academic aides and fewer aides for unskilled work than do smaller projects, regardless of rural-urban location. But, at every size level, urban projects tend to have more office aides and fewer aides for unskilled work than do rural projects.

In regard to work station (Table 3.7), the overwhelming majority of all NYC enrollees work in the public high schools of the nation. The size of the majority, however, decreases from four-fifths to two-thirds ✓ as one moves from small urban projects to large urban projects. The slack is picked up by enrollees working in schools run under religious auspices and in private non-profit agencies--e.g., YMCA, Community Action

TABLE 3.4

PROJECT TYPE AND WHETHER AGENCY RAN A PROJECT LAST YEAR

(Per Cent "Yes")

Size	County			Total
	Urban	Rural	Mixed	
Small	48.3	60.0	62.5	66.1
Medium	66.5	63.0		
Large	87.6	79.0		

N	1,249
NA	8
Total	1,257

TABLE 3.5

PROJECT TYPE AND GRADE IN SCHOOL

(Mean Grade of Enrollees)

Size	County		
	Urban	Rural	Mixed
Small	11.2 (87)	11.3 (350)	11.1 (64)
Medium	11.0 (258)	11.0 (209)	
Large	11.0 (145)	10.9 (144)	

Total 1,257

TABLE 3.6

PROJECT TYPE AND JOB CLASSIFICATION

(Mean Per Cent in Each Job Classification)

Job Classification	Project Type						Mixed
	Small		Medium		Large		
	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	
Academic	8.9	4.0	13.3	11.5	19.9	20.2	9.9
Library	12.3	8.0	9.0	9.6	7.3	8.2	12.8
Special programs	.7	.4	2.1	2.0	3.7	2.8	.5
Office	24.2	16.6	22.8	18.9	21.9	13.6	18.0
Hospital	.7	.7	2.8	2.6	3.8	2.6	2.3
Service	7.0	7.8	7.8	8.1	8.8	11.2	10.0
Unskilled	41.0	56.0	30.7	37.8	25.7	31.7	40.7
Skilled	2.6	3.5	5.7	6.1	4.7	5.6	4.3
Other	1.3	.6	2.6	1.8	3.4	1.7	1.8
Total*	98.7	97.6	96.8	98.4	99.2	97.6	100.3
(N)	(87)	(350)	(258)	(209)	(145)	(144)	(64)

*Column totals fall short of 100 per cent more than should be expected through normal rounding because of the computer program used to obtain the cell means. Each cell entry is subject to a series of roundings, and the column totals cumulate them.

TABLE 3.7

PROJECT TYPE AND WORK-STATION

(Mean Per Cent at Each Work Station)

Job Classification	Project Type						Mixed
	Small		Medium		Large		
	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	
Public schools .	81.7	85.8	70.8	77.2	65.8	83.4	87.9
Private schools .	.2	.3	.3	.2	.2	.6	1.2
Religious schools .	--	2.2	2.9	2.0	7.2	1.1	.1
Hospitals .	1.5	.8	3.7	2.7	4.2	2.9	2.0
Federal agencies	--	.8	1.1	2.6	1.4	2.4	.2
Other public agencies	6.2	4.8	9.2	8.1	7.9	4.0	3.4
Private agencies	5.4	.7	6.2	1.7	9.2	1.1	2.1
Other . . .	.2	--	2.1	.8	1.1	.3	.5
Total*. .	98.2	95.4	96.3	95.3	97.0	95.8	97.4
(N) . . .	(87)	(350)	(258)	(209)	(145)	(144)	(64)

*Column totals fall short of 100 per cent more than should be expected through normal rounding because of the computer program used to obtain the cell means. Each cell entry is subject to a series of roundings, and the column totals cumulate them.

Programs; here the figures are 7.2 per cent and 9.2 per cent, respectively, for enrollees in large urban projects. Apparently work station diversity is somewhat less possible in all rural areas, regardless of project size.

Summary: Analysis of the data indicated that the two analytically independent variables which are in fact closely related to the other independent variables--but which in themselves are the two most potent variables--are project size and location in a rural vs. urban county. Therefore we constructed a Project Type Index based on these two characteristics and cross-tabulated it with the other analytically independent variables. The cross-tabulations showed that the Project Type Index, with small discrepancies, in fact summarizes the force of the other independent variables. The rest of this report presents substantive findings based on Sponsors' Questionnaires and on the location of projects in the Project Type Index.

CHAPTER IV

RECRUITMENT OF ENROLLEES

Enrollees to Neighborhood Youth Corps projects are recruited in two ways: personally, through personal contact between the youth and some adult (teacher, social worker, minister), and impersonally, in which the student reads some notice or hears an announcement directed not at him alone, but to students generally. Projects were characterized as recruiting "personally" or "impersonally" according to the responses of their directors to the following items on the questionnaire:

> Q. 4: Do you get your in-school enrollees because some adult personally approached them or told you about them? Or do you get them through some less personal means--e.g., posters, announcements, general publicity?
>
> Q. 4A: Do more of your in-school enrollees come because of personal contact with adults or do more come because of less personal communication?

Projects were identified as recruiting "personally" if most of their enrollees came as a result of some adult contact or suggestion, and "impersonally" if most of their enrollees came through a less personal form of contact. Projects which recruited enrollees in both ways were characterized as recruiting "personally" if more than half came through adult contact, and "impersonally" if more than half came through a less personal form. Projects which indicated that their enrollees came "half and half" from each source were not categorized. Seven hundred and nine projects were classified as recruiting "personally" (70.2 per cent of those classified), and 300 projects were classified as recruiting "impersonally" (29.7 per cent of those classified).

Table 4.1 shows the relationship between type of recruitment and Project Type. The differences are small: small urban projects are less likely than medium-size or large urban projects to recruit personally, but there are no size differences among rural projects. At each size level, urban projects are more likely to recruit personally than are rural projects, though there is little difference among small projects.

TABLE 4.1

PROJECT TYPE AND TYPE OF RECRUITMENT OF ENROLLEES

(Per Cent "Personal" Type of Recruitment)

Size	County			Total
	Urban	Rural	Mixed	
Small	69.5 (69)	66.4 (298)	62.7 (51)	70.2 (1,009)
Medium	76.5 (196)	68.3 (158)		
Large	76.6 (120)	69.2 (117)		

N	1,009
"Half and half"	161
NA, don't know	87
Total	1,257

Project directors were asked to indicate what types of people were instrumental in recruiting enrollees; Table 4.2 shows the per cent of projects which rated each type of source as obtaining the "most" enrollees. School personnel are the sources of most enrollees in two-thirds of the projects (67.6 per cent), and NYC staff members recruit the most in about one-quarter of the projects (26.3 per cent). Clergy and community house and social workers account for most of the enrollees in .2 per cent and 2.5 per cent of the projects, respectively.

Though these overall rankings do not change, differences among projects appear when Project Type is considered. Medium-size projects are more likely than others to get most of their enrollees through NYC staff members, and less likely to get them through school personnel. Within each size category, urban projects are more likely than rural ones to get enrollees through NYC staff, and less likely to get them through school personnel. There are no differences among projects in the proportion of enrollees obtained through clergy and community workers; in fact, only in large urban projects are any enrollees recruited by clergymen not connected with a school system.

Most projects obtained enrollees through impersonal as well as through personal sources, and project directors were asked to rank the relative importance of these as well (Table 4.3). Three-quarters (75.4 per cent) of the projects report "most" enrollees coming as a result of school announcements; almost ten per cent (9.5) report most coming through the employment service, and less than five per cent report most coming as a result of school signs (4.7 per cent) or publicity in the community (3.6 per cent). There are few differences due to Project Type; medium-size and large rural projects are more likely than urban ones to obtain enrollees through school announcements, though to a very slight degree the reverse is true among small projects.

Table 4.4 summarizes the ratings by project directors of the relative importance of the various sources of enrollees. Among personal sources, school personnel are most important, followed by NYC project staff, community workers, and clergy. Among less personal sources school

TABLE 4.2

PROJECT TYPE AND SOURCE OF ENROLLEES: PERSONAL RECRUITMENT

(Per Cent "Most" Enrollees From Each Source)

Personal Source	Project Type							
	Small		Medium		Large		Mixed	Total
	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural		
NYC staff	20.5	16.1	35.8	27.6	22.9	15.5	68.5	26.3
School personnel .	72.0	78.8	53.7	66.6	69.6	84.4	29.6	67.6
Nonschool clergy .	--	--	--	--	2.2	--	--	.2
Community workers .	2.9	2.0	5.0	2.3	2.9	--	--	2.5
"Minimum base N"	(68)	(248)	(237)	(170)	(135)	(129)	(54)	(1,041)

TABLE 4.3

PROJECT TYPE AND SOURCE OF ENROLLEES: LESS PERSONAL RECRUITMENT

(Per Cent "Most" Enrollees From Each Source)

Less Personal Source	Project Type							
	Small		Medium		Large		Mixed	Total
	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural		
School signs . .	2.0	8.6	3.6	5.3	2.5	2.6	6.2	4.7
Employment service	12.5	9.1	11.9	9.5	12.9	4.4	2.0	9.5
School announcements	77.5	73.4	67.0	76.9	73.5	87.5	87.5	75.4
Publicity in community	--	1.7	7.2	2.9	5.1	1.7	2.0	3.6
"Minimum base N"	(48)	(174)	(192)	(168)	(116)	(112)	(48)	(859)

TABLE 4.4

MEAN RANK-ORDER OF IMPORTANCE OF SOURCES OF ENROLLEES
(Lower Rank Numbers Are Most Important Sources)

Personal Communication		Less Personal Communication	
Source	Mean Rank	Source	Mean Rank
School personnel . .	1.5	School announcements	1.5
NYC project staff . .	2.6	School signs and posters	3.6
Staff of community centers, settlement houses, etc. . . .	3.8	Employment service	3.8
Clergy not in schools	4.5	Publicity in local community churches, settlement houses, etc.	4.1
Other	4.7	Other	4.6

announcements are most important, followed by school signs, the employment service and community publicity. The majority of all enrollees are recruited through the schools.

Table 4.5 shows that in about one-fifth of the projects (21.3 per cent), half or more of the enrollees come as a result of suggestions or encouragement by their friends. Medium-size and large urban projects are more likely than small ones to get at least half of their enrollees through the suggestions of their friends; large rural projects are more likely than smaller ones to get at least half their enrollees in this manner. Small and large rural projects are somewhat more likely than urban projects to get enrollees via friends; the reverse is true of medium-size projects.

Project directors were also asked to indicate whether, as part of their recruitment procedures, they attempted only to recruit impoverished youths, or whether they also recruited those with additional problems--disciplinary, psychological, educational, etc. An index was constructed from their responses with the data from items 8 and 8A (cf. Appendix C, p. 5). Projects were identified as recruiting only poor youths if they so indicated in Question 8, or if their response to Question 8A indicated that half or fewer of their enrollees had additional problems. Projects identified as recruiting youths with additional problems were those so indicated in Question 8, or indicating that at least a little more than half had additional problems (Question 8A). Table 4.6 presents this information. Overall, more than a third of the projects (36.2 per cent) recruit youngsters with additional problems. Medium-size and large urban projects are about twice as likely to recruit youths with additional problems as are all rural projects and small urban ones. There are almost no differences among rural projects, though the small ones are even less likely (25.3 per cent) than the larger ones (29.7 and 30.3 per cent) to recruit enrollees with additional problems.

TABLE 4.5

PROJECT TYPE AND ENROLLMENT AS A RESULT OF FRIENDS

(Per Cent with "Half or More" Enrollees
Recruited This Way)

Size	County			Total
	Urban	Rural	Mixed	
Small . .	11.0 (81)	18.7 (312)	31.6 (63)	21.3 (1,200)
Medium .	25.2 (253)	18.8 (206)		
Large . .	21.2 (145)	24.1 (140)		

N	1,200
NA	57
Total	1,257

TABLE 4.6

PROJECT TYPE AND RECRUITMENT

(Per Cent of Projects At Least Half of Whose Enrollees have "Additional Problems")

Size	County			Total
	Urban	Rural	Mixed	
Small	27.0 (85)	25.3 (335)	34.9 (63)	36.2 (1,206)
Medium . . .	52.2 (249)	29.7 (198)		
Large	54.6 (141)	30.3 (135)		

N	1,206
Other, NA	51
Total	1,257

CHAPTER V

COUNSELING AND GUIDANCE

The benefit an enrollee derives from his participation in NYC comes not only from his job and the income which it provides, but also from the availability of professional counseling and guidance services. This section will describe the distribution of these services among the In-School projects, using the basic categories of Project Type to distinguish among different projects. A composite Guidance Score will be presented first, some of the components of that score will be discussed, and then the assistance that an enrollee receives as he terminates his enrollment will be described.

A total of sixteen separate items in the questionnaire were devoted to the type of counseling and guidance facilities available to enrollees. In order to summarize this material before proceeding to analyze it in detail, a "Guidance Score" was developed, composed of the following five items (cf. Appendix C, beginning on p. 6):

Q. 12: In-school enrollees receive counseling at the time of their enrollment in NYC, and because of this enrollment, whether or not professional counseling is normally available to students in the schools they attend.

Q. 13: Enrollees receive regularly scheduled counseling at least weekly during their enrollment, whether this counseling is provided by NYC or by the school.

Q. 16: Enrollees receive tests which the school does not normally administer to its students.

Q. 17: All or almost all enrollees receive termination interviews if a) they leave when the program terminates and b) if they leave before the program terminates.

A project received a score of "one" for each item if it indicated that it met the criterion stated by the item; if it did not, it received a "zero." The sum of the scores equals the guidance score for a given project.

Table 5.1 shows the distribution of guidance scores. The relatively high No Answer rate (11.6 per cent) is due, of course, to the fact that NA rates to the individual components of the score were added together when the composite index was created. The mid-point of the distribution falls between score 2 and score 3; in the table that follows (Table 5.2), scores of 0 - 2 will be considered "low," and scores 3 - 5 will be considered "high."

As Table 5.2 indicates, the per cent of projects that are "high" on the Guidance Score increases with project size, regardless of whether the county is rural or urban. Only among small projects does county type make a difference; small urban projects are less likely to have "high" guidance scores than small rural projects.

What of the components of this index? It is useful to know the distribution of each kind of counseling available, and Table 5.3 presents this information. (It should be noted that in this table, cell percentages refer to the proportion of projects which do not offer the particular kind of counseling mentioned.) There is a consistent relationship between size and the likelihood that counseling is not normally available to students, that enrollees do not get counseling at the time of their enrollment, and that once enrolled they do not get counseling at regular intervals, with small projects being most likely to fail to provide these services, middle-size projects next most likely, and large projects least likely not to provide them. While small projects are also least likely to give enrollees special tests, there are no important differences between medium-size and large projects on this item.

There are few differences between rural and urban projects of any given size in their likelihood of not providing these services, and in only one case does the difference exceed 5 per cent--the likelihood of not providing additional tests to NYC enrollees. Small rural projects

TABLE 5.1

GUIDANCE SCORE

(Distribution of Projects With
Each Score: Per Cent)

Score	Per Cent
0	4.2
1	14.6
2	23.9
3	27.3
4	15.2
5	2.8
NA	11.6
Total	99.6

N 1,257

TABLE 5.2

PROJECT TYPE AND GUIDANCE SCORE

(Per Cent High [3-5] on Guidance Score)

Size	County			Total
	Urban	Rural	Mixed	
Small	39.9 (70)	46.3 (300)	51.5 (58)	51.3 (1,110)
Medium	52.1 (228)	53.7 (180)		
Large	57.2 (138)	58.6 (136)		

N	1,110
NA	147
Total	1,257

TABLE 5.3

PROJECT TYPE AND AVAILABILITY OF COUNSELING AND TESTING

(Per Cent _Not_ Offering This Type of Guidance)

Guidance Type	Project Type							
	Small		Medium		Large		Mixed	Total
	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural		
Professional Counseling normally unavailable to students . .	13.9 (86)	17.2 (348)	3.9 (256)	5.7 (209)	2.0 (145)	6.9 (144)	11.1 (63)	8.3 (1,251)
Enrollees do not get counseling at time of enrollment .	32.1 (87)	31.8 (348)	16.7 (257)	21.0 (209)	8.9 (145)	13.1 (144)	31.2 (64)	20.5 (1,254)
Enrollees do not get counseling at regular intervals .	32.5 (83)	28.5 (350)	22.6 (256)	17.2 (209)	11.0 (145)	11.1 (144)	28.1 (64)	20.1 (1,251)
Enrollees do not get tests not given to other students . .	97.7 (87)	88.2 (349)	79.4 (258)	82.7 (208)	77.1 (144)	72.7 (143)	87.5 (64)	81.1 (1,253)

are more likely to provide such tests than their urban counterparts; this rural-urban difference is not found among larger projects. Thus we see that the Guidance Score is an accurate summary of the kinds of counseling available, and that project size accounts for most of the variation; when all the types of counseling are combined, however, the Guidance Score indicates the advantage small rural projects have over small urban ones.

Project directors were asked to indicate what kinds of counseling or tests their enrollees receive at each stage in the program. This information is presented in Table 5.5, but a convenient summary measure is available in Table 5.4. As well as identifying the particular types of counseling or testing available, a simple total of the number of each type provided gives some indication of the extent of services provided by each type of project. Table 5.4 presents the proportion of projects in which at least three kinds of counseling of each type are available, and which give more than two kinds of tests to their enrollees. As can be seen from this table, projects in urban areas are much more likely than those in rural areas to offer more types of counseling, and the larger the project the more likely it is to provide more types of counseling. ✓

Medium-size and large projects are more likely than small ones to offer more types of counseling at the time of enrollment; small and large projects in urban areas are more likely than those in rural areas to offer such counseling, but there is no difference among medium-size projects.

The larger the urban project, the more likely it is to offer more regular types of counseling during enrollment; this is true for small and medium-size rural projects but not for large rural projects. There are no rural-urban differences among small projects; rural medium-size projects are more likely than urban ones to offer regular counseling, and the reverse is true for the large projects.

There are few differences between projects in the likelihood that they give more than two kinds of tests to enrollees during their participation in the program. Very few projects give any tests at all, as can be

TABLE 5.4

PROJECT TYPE AND NUMBER OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF COUNSELING OR TESTING

(Per Cent of Projects Offering This Number)

Number of This Type of Counseling or Testing Available	Project Type							
	Small		Medium		Large		Mixed	Total
	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural		
Professional counseling normally available to students --3 or 4 types . . .	60.8 (74)	32.6 (288)	67.9 (246)	36.7 (297)	74.6 (142)	49.2 (134)	45.6 (57)	48.7 (1,238)
Counseling at time of enrollment in NYC Program --3 or 4 types . . .	28.8 (59)	21.5 (237)	43.0 (214)	41.8 (165)	48.5 (132)	39.2 (125)	25.0 (44)	28.0 (976)
Counseling at regular intervals during program-3 or 4 types	30.4 (56)	29.2 (250)	44.9 (198)	50.3 (173)	54.3 (129)	44.5 (128)	34.8 (46)	32.4 (980)
Special tests for NYC enrollees--more than 2 types . .	* (2)	31.5 (41)	32.0 (53)	22.1 (36)	33.2 (33)	30.6 (39)	* (8)	30.0 (212)

TABLE 5.5

PROJECT TYPE AND KINDS OF COUNSELING AVAILABLE TO NYC ENROLLEES

(Per Cent of All Projects with Each Kind, No Exclusions)

Type of Counseling	Project Type							
	Small		Medium		Large		Mixed	Total
	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural		
a) Professional counseling normally availabe to students in NYC schools:								
Vocational . . .	77.0	64.0	87.2	84.2	88.2	79.8	79.6	78.4
Psychological . .	57.4	26.0	66.2	50.7	73.7	45.1	37.5	48.8
Educational . . .	77.0	79.7	93.4	89.9	97.2	90.2	87.5	87.6
b) Special counseling for NYC students upon enrollment in program:								
Vocational . . .	60.9	53.4	76.3	70.8	82.7	75.0	62.5	67.8
Psychological . .	22.9	15.4	36.8	33.9	41.3	34.0	17.1	28.6
Educational . . .	55.1	60.0	68.6	71.2	80.6	79.8	60.9	68.0
c) Regularly scheduled counseling during enrollment:								
Vocational . . .	60.9	60.2	70.1	77.5	83.4	80.5	68.7	70.6
Psychological . .	55.1	65.1	69.7	77.0	80.6	86.1	68.7	71.7
Educational . . .	16.0	21.7	34.1	36.8	44.8	34.7	21.8	30.5
d) Special tests for NYC enrollees during enrollment:								
Achievement . . .	--	5.7	6.6	6.2	5.5	10.4	3.1	5.9
Intelligence . .	1.1	3.4	6.2	2.9	6.2	6.3	4.7	4.4
Aptitude	1.1	6.6	15.1	9.6	13.1	15.3	9.4	10.3
Psychological . .	1.1	2.9	3.9	2.9	7.6	6.9	3.1	3.9
Vocational . . .	--	7.7	11.2	12.4	14.5	20.8	6.3	10.8
(N)	(87)	(350)	(258)	(209)	(145)	(144)	(64)	(1,257)

seen by the size of the bases of the percentages for that row (and from Table 5.5, part d), and of those that do, medium-size rural projects are least likely of all to give more than two types.

What kinds of counseling are available? Table 5.5 details the kinds of counseling and testing available to enrollees at various stages in their participation in the program. Generally, urban projects and larger projects are more likely to draw enrollees from schools which normally offer counseling to their students than are smaller and rural projects (part a). This is most clear in the case of the availability of psychological counseling, though even here large rural projects are less likely than medium-size ones to offer such counseling. There is little rural-urban difference among small projects in their likelihood of offering educational counseling.

Except for educational counseling, larger projects and urban projects are more likely than smaller and rural ones to provide special counseling for NYC students as a result of their enrollment in the program (part b). There is little difference between rural and urban projects with respect to educational counseling, and that which exists favors the rural projects. There is also no difference between medium-size and large rural projects in their offering of special psychological counseling, though both offer such services more frequently than small rural projects.

The variation with respect to regularly scheduled counseling is less consistent (part c). There is no rural-urban difference among small projects in their likelihood of offering vocational counseling; medium-size rural projects are more likely to offer such counseling than urban ones, and the reverse is slightly true for large projects. Rural projects are consistently more likely than urban ones to offer regular psychological counseling, regardless of size; small and medium-size rural projects are also more likely than urban projects to offer educational counseling at regular intervals, but the reverse is true for the large projects. However, except for large rural projects and except for educational counseling, the availability of each type of counseling varies directly with project size.

seen by the size of the bases of the percentages for that row (and from Table 5.5, part d), and of those that do, medium-size rural projects are least likely of all to give more than two types.

What kinds of counseling are available? Table 5.5 details the kinds of counseling and testing available to enrollees at various stages in their participation in the program. Generally, urban projects and larger projects are more likely to draw enrollees from schools which normally offer counseling to their students than are smaller and rural projects (part a). This is most clear in the case of the availability of psychological counseling, though even here large rural projects are less likely than medium-size ones to offer such counseling. There is little rural-urban difference among small projects in their likelihood of offering educational counseling.

Except for educational counseling, larger projects and urban projects are more likely than smaller and rural ones to provide special counseling for NYC students as a result of their enrollment in the program (part b). There is little difference between rural and urban projects with respect to educational counseling, and that which exists favors the rural projects. There is also no difference between medium-size and large rural projects in their offering of special psychological counseling, though both offer such services more frequently than small rural projects.

The variation with respect to regularly scheduled counseling is less consistent (part c). There is no rural-urban difference among small projects in their likelihood of offering vocational counseling; medium-size rural projects are more likely to offer such counseling than urban ones, and the reverse is slightly true for large projects. Rural projects are consistently more likely than urban ones to offer regular psychological counseling, regardless of size; small and medium-size rural projects are also more likely than urban projects to offer educational counseling at regular intervals, but the reverse is true for the large projects. However, except for large rural projects and except for educational counseling, the availability of each type of counseling varies directly with project size.

Since so few projects give any kind of special tests (part d), there is not much variation among them. Small urban projects give practically no tests at all; large rural ones give the most, but there are few differences between these extremes.

Most projects report that enrollees receive termination interviews when they leave at the end of the program, and a slightly greater number report that enrollees receive such interviews if they leave before the program terminates. Table 5.6 shows the distribution of these responses by project type. In every case, enrollees are more likely to receive termination interviews if they leave the program before it ends (part b) than if they leave when it ends (part a). Medium-size urban projects are most likely to give all their enrollees interviews in the latter case, but the differences among projects on this item are small. Similarly, there is little consistent variation among projects in the likelihood that they will give all their enrollees termination interviews if they leave the program before it ends. In both cases, however, smaller projects are more likely to report giving such interviews to "few or none" of their enrollees than were larger projects. Moreover, small and medium-size rural projects are slightly more likely than urban ones to report that "few or none" of their enrollees receive termination interviews if they leave at the end of the program; this difference was reversed for the large projects, where more urban projects reported giving "few or none" of their enrollees interviews in such circumstances.

But termination interviews and guidance during the period of enrollment may be of little help if, once the program ends, the ex-enrollee is left to his own devices insofar as finding a job or carrying out some other plan is concerned. Tables 5.7 and 5.8 present data showing what projects do for the enrollee at the end of his enrollment. Project directors were asked whether the enrollee's future plans were ascertained, and by whom. Table 5.7 presents the answers to this question. The larger the project, the more likely someone is to find out what the enrollee plans to do (for the proportion reporting "no set procedure" declines with size), with no difference between rural and urban projects except

TABLE 5.6

PROJECT TYPE AND TERMINATION INTERVIEWS FOR ENROLLEES

(Per Cent "All" Receive and "Few or None" Receive Such Interviews)

Proportion Receiving Interviews	Project Type							
	Small		Medium		Large		Mixed	Total
	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural		
	a) If they leave when program terminates:							
All . . .	56.1	54.6	59.2	53.1	51.0	52.1	64.5	51.2
Few/none	17.8	23.4	7.9	10.5	14.8	8.6	11.2	13.3
	(73)	(324)	(238)	(190)	(141)	(138)	(62)	(1,166)
	b) If they leave before program terminates:							
All . . .	61.3	62.9	66.5	69.3	70.1	63.3	82.8	62.6
Few/none	16.0	18.0	4.3	8.1	1.3	1.4	3.1	8.0
	(75)	(310)	(251)	(196)	(144)	(142)	(64)	(1,182)

a) N 1,166
NA 91
Total . . . 1,257

b) N 1,182
NA 75
Total . . . 1,257

TABLE 5.7

PROJECT TYPE AND INFORMATION ABOUT ENROLLEE'S FUTURE PLANS

(Per Cent of Projects in Which Plans Are Ascertained by Each Agency)

Who Finds Out Future Plans of Enrollees?	Project Type							
	Small		Medium		Large		Mixed	Total
	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural		
School . .	48.7	48.0	34.9	36.3	20.9	19.5	38.0	36.4
NYC . . .	3.6	5.0	11.5	8.0	21.6	12.5	6.3	9.6
Both . . .	13.4	12.0	27.3	25.7	40.5	39.1	28.5	24.9
No set procedure	34.1	34.8	26.1	29.7	16.7	28.6	26.9	28.9
Total . .	99.8	99.8	99.8	99.7	99.7	99.7	99.7	99.8
(N) . . .	(82)	(339)	(252)	(198)	(143)	(143)	(63)	(1,220)

N	1,220
NA	37
Total	1,257

TABLE 5.8

PROJECT TYPE AND EMPLOYMENT HELP FOR GRADUATING ENROLLEES

(Per Cent of Projects in Which Enrollees
Are Helped by Each Agency)

Who Helps Enrollees Get Jobs?	Project Type							
	Small		Medium		Large		Mixed	Total
	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural		
School . .	23.4	25.4	11.5	11.5	10.3	7.0	20.9	16.0
NYC . . .	7.4	4.1	19.9	13.5	27.5	14.1	1.6	12.9
Both . .	19.7	13.6	29.4	30.6	41.3	49.6	30.6	28.4
Neither .	11.1	10.6	5.5	6.0	2.7	2.1	9.6	6.9
No set procedure	38.2	46.1	33.4	38.1	17.9	26.9	37.0	35.6
Total .	99.8	99.8	99.7	99.7	99.7	99.7	99.7	99.8
(N) . .	(81)	(338)	(251)	(199)	(145)	(141)	(62)	(1,217)

N	1,217
NA	40
Total	1,257

among the large ones. While large urban projects are least likely of all to have no set procedure for ascertaining future plans, large rural projects are no more likely than medium-size rural projects to find out what the enrollee plans in the future.

There are few differences between rural and urban projects of each size in the likelihood of enrollee plans being ascertained. The larger the project, the more likely is NYC to do this job, and the less likely is the school. It is not clear from the data whether this increased role of NYC is a replacement of the school's function or a supplementation of it; the percentages for "both" ascertaining plans, however, suggest a supplementary role for NYC, especially since the likelihood of NYC alone ascertaining the enrollee's future plans increases from only about 5 per cent in the small projects to some 12 to 20 per cent in the large ones, while the increase in per cent "both" ascertaining plans is from 12 or 13 per cent in small projects to about 40 per cent in the large ones.

What happens after plans are ascertained? Table 5.8 shows the distribution of projects offering help with future employment for enrollees. The larger the project, whether urban or rural, the more likely it is to have some procedure for helping enrollees find jobs. The larger the urban project, the more likely NYC will be to carry out this task; in rural projects NYC is as likely in large as it is in medium-size ones to help find future employment, though more likely in either of those than in small projects. NYC alone is, however, less likely to help find jobs in rural than in urban projects, size notwithstanding. In small urban projects the attempt is more likely to be made by both the school and NYC than it is in small rural projects; this is reversed in large projects, and there is no difference in the proportion of "both" helping in medium-size urban and rural projects. It should be noted, as can be seen in the last column of Table 5.8 ("Total"), that more than one-third (37.0 per cent) of all projects have no set procedure for helping enrollees find jobs.

Although most of the findings presented in this section have been discussed as if they were a function of the projects, it should be made clear that much of the services which are provided in the way of counseling or testing are provided by the school systems, and much of the variation among projects which our data document is undoubtedly due to the differential resources available in urban and rural areas for school counseling services. We have no data on the size of the cities or counties in which the various projects are located, but if we assume that larger projects tend to be in areas of greater population, then this also will affect the kinds of services the schools in those areas provide. In another section of this report, we shall examine the effects of the introduction of an NYC program on the services which the school provides; at this point, however, it is important to note that most of our questionnaire items regarding counseling services dealt with services which are most likely to be provided by schools.

CHAPTER VI

FUNDING

This section will describe some aspects of project financing, specifically how enrollees are paid, where the project's funds come from, and the degree to which project directors are satisfied with the funds provided for various aspects of their programs. On many of the items in this section, there was little or no variation in the marginal distributions, indicating that all or practically all projects followed the same procedures; these items will not be presented in tabular form, but referred to in the text when they are relevant.

Virtually all the projects (96.7 per cent) pay their enrollees at the same hourly rate: $1.25. Eighty-six per cent of the project ✓ directors felt that it was neither difficult to attract nor to retain enrollees at this rate; 5.9 per cent felt that it was difficult to retain enrollees at this rate, 2.9 per cent felt difficulty in attracting them, and 4 per cent felt difficulty in both attracting and retaining enrollees at the current rate of pay. Eighty-five per cent of the projects felt that their hourly rate was "just right" to run a successful program, ✓ 5 per cent felt it was too high, and 10 per cent felt it was too low. Almost 85 per cent of the projects pay their enrollees bi-monthly or every other week; 10 per cent pay weekly and 5 per cent pay monthly.

Table 6.1 shows how the enrollees receive their pay. There is no consistent pattern of payment method. Small projects are more likely than larger ones to pay by mail; large ones are more likely than smaller ones to pay on the job by supervisors; small ones are more likely to pay on the job by sponsors. Generally, the most frequent method of pay, regardless of project type, is from the supervisor on the job.

TABLE 6.1

PROJECT TYPE AND HOW ENROLLEES ARE PAID

(Per Cent of Projects Paying Enrollees in Each Manner)

Method of Pay	Project Type							
	Small		Medium		Large		Mixed	Total
	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural		
By mail . .	19.2	24.7	9.3	10.0	12.5	1.5	6.4	14.0
On the job, from supervisor . .	30.1	13.4	31.4	33.3	36.2	52.2	9.6	28.0
On the job, from sponsors . .	30.1	30.6	17.0	24.8	22.8	25.7	35.4	25.7
From sponsor at central office .	13.2	27.4	31.9	23.8	10.2	10.6	35.4	23.3
Other . . .	7.2	3.7	10.2	7.9	18.1	9.8	12.9	8.7
Total .	99.8	99.8	99.8	99.8	99.8	99.8	99.7	99.7
(N) . .	(83)	(343)	(235)	(189)	(127)	(132)	(62)	(1,171)

N	1,171
NA	86
Total	1,257

The majority of sponsors (55.6 per cent) report that they never have encountered much difficulty in meeting the in-school NYC payroll on time, and another 31.3 per cent say that they have had difficulty "only rarely." Only 1.9 per cent encounter difficulty "frequently," while almost 10 per cent (9.8) do "sometimes." Although 543 sponsors reported difficulty at least rarely, only 428 stated the source of the difficulty; of these, 177 or 41 per cent (but only 14 per cent of all sponsors) blamed the Washington office, and 201 or 47 per cent (15.9 per cent of all sponsors) blamed their own sponsoring agency. Few blamed the NYC regional office (5 per cent of all sponsors) or an intermediate agency (5.4 per cent).

Table 6.2 shows the source of project funds. The most common source of funds is directly from NYC or OEO, and the larger the project the more likely it is to receive funds in this manner. There are no rural-urban differences among small projects regarding this type of funding; medium-size urban projects are more likely than rural ones to be funded directly from NYC or OEO, and large urban projects are less likely than large rural ones to be so funded.

Small projects are more likely than larger ones to be funded through a local or state community action agency, with few rural-urban differences. Urban projects are more likely than rural ones, small and medium-size, to be funded through some other state or county agency, though there is less difference among large projects. Small and medium rural projects are somewhat more likely than urban ones to be funded through a private community action agency; there is no difference among large projects.

Practically all large projects are funded directly from NYC or OEO, as are most medium-size ones. Medium-size projects are most likely next to be funded by a public agency other than a community action agency, as are small projects. Small projects are also funded about one-fifth of the time by a public community action agency. Small projects have the greatest variety of funding sources; large projects have the least.

TABLE 6.2

PROJECT TYPE AND SOURCE OF FUNDS

(Per Cent of Projects Reporting Each Source)

Source of Funds	Project Type							
	Small		Medium		Large		Mixed	Total
	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural		
Directly from NYC or OEO	45.0	45.4	73.8	67.4	81.9	90.9	37.0	64.1
Through public community action agency . .	20.0	18.2	2.4	7.7	10.4	6.2	--	10.1
Through other public agency . .	32.5	26.8	22.4	16.0	4.8	.6	62.9	20.6
Through private community action agency . .	2.5	9.4	1.2	8.7	2.7	2.0	--	5.0
Total . . .	100.0	99.8	99.8	99.8	99.8	99.7	99.9	99.8
(N)	(80)	(339)	(249)	(206)	(144)	(144)	(62)	(1,224)

N	1,224
NA	33
Total	1,257

Table 6.3 presents the evaluations by project directors of the adequacy of federal funding for each of the following program areas: administration, counseling, testing, office supplies and transportation. In every area except testing, the larger the project the more adequate the funding. With regard to testing, there is no difference between medium-size and large projects, though both find funding more adequate than do small ones. This is true for both rural and urban projects. Moreover, in most cases rural projects are more satisfied with funding than urban projects of the same size; where these differences are not found it is always in medium or large projects; small urban projects are always less satisfied with funding than are small rural ones. Rural-urban differences are small in medium-size projects for counseling and testing, and in large projects for counseling. There are slight tendencies for large urban projects to be more satisfied than large rural ones with funding for office supplies and transportation.

There is little consistency in the proportion of projects finding funding inadequate, nor are differences great. The responses of "irrelevant to me," however, complement those of "adequate"; the smaller the project, whether urban or rural, the more likely is funding in any area to be seen as irrelevant. Among small projects, moreover, urban projects are consistently more likely than rural projects to find funding irrelevant; in medium-size and large projects the differences between rural and urban projects are not consistent.

It is clear from Table 6.3 that the larger the project, the more likely it is to depend on federal funding for various aspects of its program. It might also be the case that smaller projects find funding less relevant because the range of services they offer is not as great and they see less opportunity to take advantage of the funds which might be available.

Perhaps the most important aspect of a project's funding is whether the budget is adequate to take care of all potential enrollees. Table 6.4 presents the project directors' evaluations of the extent to which this is true. The single most important fact here is that 72 per cent of all

TABLE 6.3

PROJECT TYPE AND FUNDING ADEQUACY

(Per Cent with Given Evaluation of Funding for Each Item)

Category	Funding for This Category is:	Project Type							
		Small		Medium		Large		Mixed	Total
		Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural		
Administration	Adequate	29.6	41.4	56.1	61.3	68.7	80.8	60.6	55.9
	Inadequate	20.9	18.3	30.7	20.1	28.3	16.3	18.0	22.3
	Irrelevant	49.3	40.1	13.1	18.5	2.8	2.8	21.3	21.7
	(N) . .	(81)	(316)	(244)	(199)	(141)	(141)	(61)	(1,183)
Counseling	Adequate	33.7	43.0	53.7	51.5	61.4	62.5	45.9	50.7
	Inadequate	20.7	20.9	28.0	27.0	30.0	23.5	22.9	24.9
	Irrelevant	45.4	36.0	18.1	21.5	8.5	13.9	31.1	24.3
	(N) . .	(77)	(311)	(242)	(200)	(140)	(136)	(61)	(1,167)
Testing	Adequate	27.0	31.3	43.4	43.5	45.0	51.9	37.9	40.0
	Inadequate	17.5	21.5	17.0	23.0	21.4	18.6	18.9	20.1
	Irrelevant	55.4	47.0	39.5	33.3	33.5	29.4	43.1	39.8
	(N) . .	(74)	(306)	(235)	(195)	(140)	(129)	(58)	(1,137)
Office supplies	Adequate	26.6	33.3	59.4	65.1	80.7	78.9	51.6	55.7
	Inadequate	14.6	16.9	16.3	12.5	12.8	15.2	11.6	14.9
	Irrelevant	58.6	49.6	24.2	22.3	6.4	5.7	36.6	29.3
	(N) . .	(75)	(312)	(239)	(192)	(140)	(138)	(60)	(1,156)
Transportation	Adequate	21.3	28.1	42.3	50.5	68.5	65.0	31.6	43.9
	Inadequate	16.0	10.8	26.9	16.8	15.7	22.8	20.0	18.0
	Irrelevant	62.6	60.9	30.7	32.6	15.7	12.1	48.3	37.9
	(N) . .	(75)	(305)	(241)	(190)	(140)	(140)	(60)	(1,151)

N.B.: Column totals fall between 99.8 and 100 per cent. NA rates do not exceed 10 per cent.

TABLE 6.4

PROJECT TYPE AND BUDGET ADEQUACY

(Per Cent with More Eligible
Students than Budget Allows)

Size	County			Total
	Urban	Rural	Mixed	
Small	38.5 (83)	77.2 (343)	65.6 (64)	72.0 (1,240)
Medium	56.6 (256)	79.1 (206)		
Large	83.4 (145)	87.4 (143)		

N 1,240

NA 17

Total 1,257

sponsors report that they have more students eligible for NYC than their budgets allow them to enroll. Virtually all large projects (83 per cent of the urban ones, 87 per cent of the rural) make this statement. And better than three-quarters of all small or medium-size rural projects (77 per cent and 79 per cent) say the same. The majority of the medium-size urban projects (56 per cent) make the same claim. Only the small urban projects seem to be satisfied that they are serving all potential enrollees--and even in this category, a healthy minority (38.5 per cent) say they have more students eligible for enrollment than they can actually enroll.

CHAPTER VII

SUPERVISION AND WORK LOAD

As might be expected, the larger the project, the more people it has serving as work station supervisors. Table 7.1 shows the mean number of supervisors by type of project; while there are no differences between urban and rural, small or medium-size projects, large urban projects have almost two-and-one-half times as many supervisors as large rural ones. The extent of this rural-urban difference among large projects is partly a result of the manner in which the Project Type Index was constructed; as can be seen in Table 3.1, the large urban projects are larger than the large rural ones. The differences among size categories are not affected by this, however, and as Table 3.7 indicated, the range of work station placements is greater in urban than in rural projects, so that it would be reasonable to expect a larger number of supervisors in these urban projects.

Table 7.2 shows the span of control these supervisors exercise--that is, how many enrollees they are responsible for. There is a tendency, greater in rural than in urban projects, for the mean number of enrollees supervised by one supervisor to increase as project size increases. Moreover, although there is not much difference by county type among small and medium-size projects, supervisors in large rural projects are more likely than their urban counterparts to supervise a greater number of enrollees. Together with the preceding table (Table 7.1), this is evidence that rural projects do have fewer supervisors relative to the size of their enrollment than do urban projects.

There is not much variation among projects in the probability that the project director will also be director of an out-of-school program. Table 7.3 shows that 34.8 per cent of the directors of in-school projects are also directors of out-of-school programs. The larger the

TABLE 7.1

PROJECT TYPE AND MEAN NUMBER OF WORK-STATION SUPERVISORS

Size	County		
	Urban	Rural	Mixed
Small	3 (85)	2 (338)	12 (61)
Medium	20 (253)	19 (201)	
Large	156 (138)	64 (135)	

N	1,211
NA	46
Total	1,257

TABLE 7.2

PROJECT TYPE AND SPAN OF SUPERVISORY CONTROL

(Mean Per Cent of Projects with Supervisors Having Given Number of Enrollees)

Number of Enrollees Superivsed	Project Type						
	Small		Medium		Large		Mixed
	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	
1 - 3	79	80	72	71	69	59	82
4 - 6	8	13	14	13	16	21	9
7 - 9	7	1	4	3	4	6	1
10+	2	--*	6	7	4	6	3
Total** .	96	94	96	94	93	92	95
(N) . . .	(87)	(350)	(258)	(209)	(145)	(144)	(64)

Total 1,257

---

*Less than 1 per cent.

**Column totals fall short of 100% more than should be expected through normal rounding because of the computer program used to obtain the cell means. Each cell entry is subject to a series of roundings, and the column totals cumulate them.

TABLE 7.3

PROJECT TYPE AND PROJECT DIRECTOR ALSO DIRECTS OUT-OF-SCHOOL PROGRAM

(Per Cent "Yes)

Size	County			Total
	Urban	Rural	Mixed	
Small	43.0 (79)	37.3 (316)	8.1 (61)	34.8 (1,196)
Medium	38.8 (255)	33.3 (198)		
Large	32.6 (144)	33.5 (143)		

N 1,196

NA 61

Total 1,257

urban project, the less likely is the project director to run an out-of-school project as well. Virtually no differences appear among rural projects: 37.3 per cent of the directors of small projects also direct out-of-school projects, while the figure for the rest of the rural project directors is 33 per cent. A few more directors of small and medium-size urban projects are directors of out-of-school projects than are directors of rural projects of the same size; there is no difference between large urban and large rural projects.

Table 7.4 shows the frequency of the personal contact, either by extended phone conversation or face to face, between the project director (or his staff) and the work-station supervisors; the percentages in the table represent the proportions of projects whose directors are in at least weekly contact with their supervisors. Almost seven-tenths (68.6 per cent) of the total group are in weekly contact with their work-station supervisors, but this varies somewhat by project type. The major difference is a result of size; small projects are less likely than larger ones to report such weekly contact, and small rural projects are the least likely of all to have contact between project directors and supervisors this frequently. The greatest proportion of weekly contacts is reported by large rural projects, and the least by small urban ones; there is, however, little difference between medium-size and large rural projects.

In addition to being in contact with work-station supervisors, the project director and his staff regularly visit the work stations. Table 7.5 reports the frequency of these visits by the project director (part a) and by members of his staff (part b). Half (50.4 per cent) of the project directors visit work stations (not necessarily each work station) more than once each week, and an additional 14.9 per cent visit work stations weekly. Slightly more projects report staff visits to work stations more frequently than weekly (52.4 per cent), and slightly fewer report weekly visits (11.8 per cent). While 3.0 per cent of the project directors never visit work stations, 13.0 per cent of the projects report that staff never do, or that there is no staff for this purpose.

TABLE 7.4

PROJECT TYPE AND FREQUENCY OF DIRECTOR'S PERSONAL CONTACT WITH WORK-STATION SUPERVISOR

(Per Cent "At Least Weekly")

Size	County			Total
	Urban	Rural	Mixed	
Small	49.9 (84)	64.9 (334)	91.9 (63)	68.6 (1,223)
Medium	69.6 (254)	72.0 (200)		
Large	66.8 (145)	74.0 (143)		

N 1,223

NA 34

Total 1,257

TABLE 7.5

PROJECT TYPE AND FREQUENCY OF WORK-STATION VISITS BY DIRECTOR AND STAFF

(Per Cent Visiting at Each Interval)

Frequency of Visits	Project Type							
	Small		Medium		Large		Mixed	Total
	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural		
	a) Project Director visits . . .							
More than once a week	24.6	54.6	49.1	55.8	46.0	47.4	71.6	50.6
Weekly . .	17.6	8.3	16.5	16.1	15.3	24.4	15.0	15.0
Less than weekly .	45.5	32.0	31.7	27.7	36.0	26.9	13.2	31.0
Never . . .	12.9	4.7	2.4	--	2.0	.6	--	3.0
Total .	100.6	99.6	99.7	99.6	99.3	99.3	99.8	99.6
(N) . .	(85)	(335)	(248)	(204)	(143)	(143)	(60)	(1,218)
	b) Project staff visits . . .							
More than once a week	25.5	50.0	50.8	53.5	69.6	63.3	44.0	52.7
Weekly . .	18.2	8.0	12.0	16.0	13.1	14.0	3.3	11.9
Less than weekly .	36.4	31.5	16.8	16.5	13.0	12.6	8.3	20.8
Never; no staff for this . .	19.4	10.0	20.4	14.0	4.1	9.8	44.0	13.0
Total .	99.5	99.5	100.0	100.0	99.8	99.7	99.6	98.4
(N) . .	(82)	(337)	(250)	(200)	(145)	(142)	(59)	(1,215)

a) N 1,218
NA 39
Total N . 1,257

b) N 1,215
NA . . 42
Total N . 1,257

In urban projects the difference in the frequency of visits by the project director is between small projects on the one hand and medium-size and large ones on the other; project directors visit the latter much more frequently. There is no difference between small and medium-size rural projects in the frequency of visits by the project director, but work stations in large rural projects see the director less often (weekly, rather than more than weekly). One reason for this might be that smaller rural projects have less staff for visits, and this might make the director visit more frequently. The director is twice as likely (54.6 per cent vs. 24.6 per cent) to visit small rural projects than he is to visit small urban projects more than weekly, a little more likely to visit medium-size rural projects than medium-size urban projects (55.8 per cent vs. 49.1 per cent), and equally likely to visit each type of large project (46.0 per cent vs. 47.4 per cent). The highest proportion reporting that the project director never visits work stations is found among the small urban projects: 12.9 per cent.

The same pattern generally holds true for staff visits to work stations, with some exceptions. There is a consistent effect of size on more-than-weekly visits by staff among urban projects: one-quarter of the small urban projects, one-half of the medium size, and two-thirds of the large urban projects report more-than-weekly staff visits. Among rural projects the magnitude of the differences is less (only 50 to 63 per cent), and it exists between the combined medium and small projects vs. the large ones. There are virtually no rural-urban differences with respect to less-than weekly visits. Finally, small and medium-size urban projects are less likely than rural ones to have staff members for such visits, or to have them in fact visiting; large urban projects are somewhat more likely to have such staff members and have them visiting, though the difference is minimal.

Half the projects (51.0 per cent) have enrollees working for supervisors by whom they were recruited, but the likelihood of this occurring varies by project type. Table 7.6 shows that only in small projects is there a rural-urban difference: small rural projects are more likely than small urban ones to have supervisors who recruited some

TABLE 7.6

PROJECT TYPE AND WHETHER THE ENROLLEES SUPERVISED ARE RECRUITED BY THE SUPERVISOR

(Per Cent "Yes")

Size	County			Total
	Urban	Rural	Mixed	
Small	35.3 (82)	44.2 (337)	48.3 (62)	51.0 (1,230)
Medium	51.5 (258)	52.4 (204)		
Large	69.6 (145)	65.4 (142)		

N	1,230
NA	27
Total	1,257

of the enrollees they supervise (44 per cent vs. 35 per cent). But there is a consistent and striking size difference for both rural and urban projects; the larger the project, the more likely is it to have supervisors who have recruited their own enrollees.

Almost none of the projects (8.8 per cent) reports that any supervisors receive additional salary for this supervision (table not shown); 89.7 per cent report that none receives extra pay. As far as recruitment of supervisors is concerned, the typical method is for the project director to do the recruiting; in a few projects (about 6 per cent of the total) the project director is approached by potential supervisors. It makes little difference in recruitment whether the work station is located within or outside of the school system.

In addition to questions about supervisory practices, project directors were asked about the number of hours worked by their NYC enrollees. Table 7.7 presents the proportion of projects all or almost all of whose enrollees work the maximum number of hours permitted by contract (part a), and the proportion of projects in which few or none of the enrollees work the maximum number of hours permitted (part b). As can be seen from the table, small projects are more likely than large ones to have all enrollees working maximum hours. This is more likely to be true in rural projects than in urban ones; small rural projects are most likely of all to have all or almost all of their enrollees working the maximum number of hours permitted by the contract, and large urban projects are least likely to have all or most of their enrollees working maximum hours. Almost half of all projects (49.3 per cent) have all or most enrollees working the maximum number of contracted hours.

On the other hand, large projects are most likely to have few or none of their enrollees working maximum hours, whether these are in urban or rural areas (part b of Table 7.7). There is little difference between small and medium-size projects, whether rural or urban in this regard. Among rural projects there is a direct relationship between size and the likelihood that few or none will be working maximum hours, although the difference between small and medium-size projects is quite small.

TABLE 7.7

PROJECT TYPE AND ENROLLEE WORK LOAD

(Per Cent "All" and "Few/None" Working Maximum
Hours Allowed by Contract)

Size	County			Total
	Urban	Rural	Mixed	
	a) "All or Almost All"			
Small	46.5 (86)	71.3 (345)	69.8 (63)	49.3 (1,235)
Medium	37.8 (251)	40.6 (204)		
Large	31.0 (145)	40.4 (141)		
	b) "Few or None"			
Small	18.6 (86)	17.3 (345)	6.3 (63)	21.2 (1,235)
Medium	19.9 (251)	21.5 (204)		
Large	30.3 (145)	31.2 (141)		

N 1,235

NA 22

Total 1,257

CHAPTER VIII

PROJECT DIRECTORS' OPINIONS: ENROLLEE SUCCESS AND NYC'S EFFECT ON THE SCHOOLS

Following the old principle, "Ask the man who knows," we asked the project directors to give us the benefit of their experience by evaluating several factors inherent in NYC programs. Taking the simplest possible definition of success in the NYC in-school program, we asked the directors to relate supervisor-enrollee ratio, type of job assignment, and the simple fact of holding an NYC job, to program success. Success we defined as "helping the enrollees to stay *in school and get better marks as well as stirring up their interest in school and future occupation*" (cf. Appendix C, p. 15).

When they were asked whether or not they found "that the smaller the number of in-school enrollees per supervisor, the greater is the likelihood of enrollee success," one-fifth of the respondents (19.6 per cent) thought this rule of thumb was "always" true, and half of them (52.6 per cent) thought it "generally" true. Less than 1 per cent thought the opposite was true; only one-fifth thought either that the supervisor-enrollee ratio was "too dependent on job assignment to make a general statement" (12.6 per cent) or that it "makes no real difference" (12.6 per cent). Only 5.8 per cent confessed to "no opinion" and 1.4 per cent failed to answer.

Despite this general agreement, the Project Type Index shows that, in general, the larger the project, the more likely is the project director to see a small supervisor-enrollee ratio as important to enrollee success (Table 8.1). The urban-rural differences are not large, but the directors of large and small *rural* projects are somewhat more likely to agree with the statement than are their urban counterparts. Ironically, as Table 7.2 showed, the larger projects, both urban and rural, tend to have *more* enrollees per supervisor than do the smaller projects.

TABLE 8.1

PROJECT TYPE AND IMPORTANCE OF SUPERVISOR-ENROLLEE RATIO FOR SUCCESS

(Per Cent "Always" or "Usually" the Smaller the Ratio
the More Chance of Sucess)

Size	County			Total
	Urban	Rural	Mixed	
Small	58.7 (85)	69.2 (342)	73.3 (64)	72.2 (1,239)
Medium	77.0 (257)	74.0 (205)		
Large	74.5 (142)	82.5 (144)		

N 1,239

NA 18

Total 1,257

When they were asked, "How important a factor is the type of job to which the enrollees is assigned?", virtually all the respondents (86.4 per cent) thought it "very" or "fairly" important, with almost half (46.6 per cent) answering "very." The Project Type Index shows that, in this case too, there is a small but consistent county and project size effect. Table 8.2 shows that, among rural projects, there is a slightly increasing tendency to see job assignment as a "very important" factor as project size increases; that there is a strong tendency for small urban projects to minimize this factor; and that the medium-size and large urban projects to maximize it more than all other project types. This situation may be a function of the greater diversity of jobs open to medium and large urban projects, and a consequent attempt on their part to fit the enrollee to the one job among several which suits him best.

When we asked the project directors to rate the usual NYC job classifications to enrollee success, what emerged was the pattern of responses presented in Table 8.3. Since the "no answer" rate is considerably higher here than in any other question, we are leaving it in the table as a special column; we think that most of those who failed to answer were really saying "I don't know," even if they did not check the "I don't know" category. What is striking about this table is that there are only three job classifications which a considerable number of project directors designate as "closely associated with program success": office aides (54.1 per cent), library aides (40.8 per cent), and academic aides (37.3 per cent); and that there is only one job category rejected by a comparatively large proportion of directors: unskilled labor (23.3 per cent).

If, however, we exclude from the table all directors who either said they did not know how closely the jobs were associated with success or failed to answer the question, we get a somewhat different pattern (Table 8.4). We think the latter pattern is more representative of the project directors because a high proportion of those who did not answer the questions came from small projects, thus probably lacking the

TABLE 8.2

PROJECT TYPE AND IMPORTANCE OF JOB TYPE TO SUCCESS

(Per Cent "Very Important")

Size	County			Total
	Urban	Rural	Mixed	
Small	34.8 (86)	40.2 (343)	51.5 (64)	46.6 (1,244)
Medium	56.0 (257)	44.1 (206)		
Large	55.5 (144)	49.3 (144)		

N	1,244
NA	13
Total	1,257

TABLE 8.3

OPINION OF PROJECT DIRECTORS ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOB CLASSIFICATION AND ENROLLEE SUCCESS

(Per Cent)

Job Classification	Association with Success			Don't Know	No Answer	Total Per Cent
	Close	Somewhat	Little or No			
Academic aide, high school	37.3	21.4	3.8	20.8	16.5	99.8
Library aides	40.8	31.2	3.9	12.9	10.9	99.7
Special academic program aides	26.7	18.7	3.1	30.3	21.0	99.8
Office aides	54.1	26.8	2.3	7.3	9.2	99.7
Hospital aides	15.8	12.1	3.0	40.9	28.0	99.8
Service aides	12.4	29.3	9.7	26.4	21.8	99.6
Unskilled manual	15.2	42.6	23.3	9.6	9.0	99.7
Semi-skilled manual	22.1	38.8	6.3	15.8	16.7	99.7

TABLE 8.4

ADJUSTED OPINIONS OF PROJECT DIRECTORS ON RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOB CLASSIFICATION AND ENROLLEE SUCCESS

(Per Cent)

Job Classification	Association with Success			Total Per Cent	N
	Close	Somewhat	Little or No		
Academic aide, high school	59.6	34.3	6.1	100.0	787
Library aides	53.7	41.1	5.2	100.0	956
Special academic program aides	54.9	38.6	6.5	100.0	612
Office aides	65.0	32.3	2.8	100.1	1,048
Hospital aides	51.0	39.2	9.7	99.9	390
Service aides	24.2	56.7	19.0	99.9	649
Unskilled manual	18.8	52.4	28.8	100.0	1,022
Semi-skilled manual	32.9	57.6	9.4	99.9	847

competence to make responsible judgments on a broader range of jobs than they had in their own projects (cf. Table 3.6). Again we see the office-aide category is still thought by the highest percentage of directors to be "closely associated" with enrollee success (65 per cent). But four other job classifications receive the same sort of endorsement from more than half the directors: academic aides in secondary schools (59.6 per cent), aides for special academic programs (54.9 per cent), library aides (53.7 per cent), and hospital aides (51 per cent). The other three categories show a decided drop in the proportions of directors endorsing them; and two of these three--unskilled aides and service aides--are rejected by comparatively high proportions of the directors (28.8 per cent and 19 per cent, respectively). No other job category is rejected by as many as 10 per cent of the respondents.

Table 8.5 brings the Project Type Index to bear on the data of the previous table. Project size has considerable effect upon whether or not a particular job category is thought to be "closely associated with enrollee success" by the project director, while the urban-rural distinction has almost no effect. If we take the classifications which are considered by the majority of project directors to be "closely associated with success" (Academic, Library, Special Programs, Office and Hospital), it is obvious that they are favored by the medium and large projects, not so much by the small ones. Nor are the small projects, especially the rural ones, so set against the "service" and "unskilled" classifications as are the larger ones. For instance, only one-quarter of the small projects think hospital work is closely associated with enrollee success, but approximately three-fifths of the large projects do; conversely, only about one-tenth of the large projects consider unskilled work so associated, while proportionately almost three times as many of the small projects do. In short, white-collar and hospital jobs are most favored, and the favoritism increases with project size.

This state of affairs is probably due to at least two factors: first, the general prestige associated with white collar vs. blue collar jobs in American society; second, the greater diversity of jobs found among

TABLE 8.5

PROJECT TYPE, JOB CLASSIFICATION, AND ENROLLEE SUCCESS

(Per Cent Saying Each Job is "Closely" Associated with Success; "Don't Know," NA Excluded)

Job Classification	Project Type							
	Small		Medium		Large		Mixed	Total
	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural		
Academic . .	* (29)	49.3 (140)	58.2 (177)	63.8 (149)	64.5 (124)	61.2 (134)	64.7 (34)	59.6 (787)
Library . .	46.5 (43)	45.6 (195)	53.2 (218)	59.6 (178)	59.8 (132)	57.4 (136)	46.3 (54)	53.7 (956)
Special programs . .	* (17)	45.9 (109)	57.1 (133)	56.2 (105)	57.6 (118)	58.3 (108)	* (22)	54.9 (612)
Office . . .	48.3 (58)	53.2 (231)	71.4 (238)	65.4 (191)	75.7 (140)	72.5 (138)	55.8 (52)	65.0 (1,048)
Hospital . .	* (8)	26.0 (50)	50.0 (90)	52.6 (76)	61.6 (73)	57.5 (80)	* (13)	51.0 (390)
Service . .	* (27)	34.0 (106)	23.0 (165)	23.0 (113)	17.3 (110)	23.7 (97)	22.6 (31)	24.2 (649)
Unskilled .	26.4 (53)	30.0 (247)	15.9 (220)	18.6 (183)	10.8 (129)	11.9 (134)	10.7 (56)	18.8 (1,022)
Skilled . .	25.6 (39)	31.6 (171)	33.7 (193)	35.5 (155)	33.9 (124)	30.1 (123)	38.1 (42)	32.9 (847)

---

*Percentages were not calculated whenever less than 30 cases fell into a cell.

larger projects and the consequently greater proportions of enrollees actually working in the blue collar categories of small projects (cf. Table 3.6). But we have no evidence which establishes that, in general, the higher the proportion of enrollees in blue collar categories, the greater the likelihood of the project director's rating it as closely associated with success.

The last of the three factors "inherent" to any NYC program is simply that the enrollee has a job for which he is paid and gets at least some counseling. We asked the directors if they thought that this opportunity for the enrollee contributed as much as anything else to program success, and 86 per cent of them said "Yes."

Finally, pressing the project directors as far as we could, we asked them to rank the factors: supervisor-enrollee ratio, type of job assignment, and the fact of having a job and some counseling. Sixty-one per cent named the latter--the fact of having a job and getting some counseling--as the most important of the three; only one-quarter (26.2 per cent) chose type of job assignment; and just under one-tenth (9.4 per cent) chose the supervisor-enrollee ratio as most important. Table 8.6 presents the mean ranks given each factor by all directors, showing that there is fairly general agreement that the job and counseling factor is considered most important, type of job assignment next most important, and supervisor-enrollee ratio third. If there had been unanimity among the directors, the ranking would have been 1.0, 2.0, and 3.0 instead of 1.5, 2.0, and 2.5. Analysis of these data by the Project Type Index revealed not only no differences in rank order according to project size and county type, but almost no differences from the overall ranking figures.

The foregoing analysis of the opinions of the people running NYC in-school programs presents a curious problem. The great majority (86 per cent) think that the simple fact of holding a paying job and getting some counseling is as important as anything else for enrollee success. Yet fitting the youngster to a job suited to him is also considered very important; and certain jobs are definitely considered more closely related to enrollee success than others.

TABLE 8.6

MEAN RANKING OF SUPERVISOR-ENROLLEE RATIO, TYPE OF JOB ASSIGNMENT, AND THE FACT OF HAVING A JOB AND SOME COUNSELING AS FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO ENROLLEE SUCCESS
(LOW RANK IS MOST IMPORTANT)

Factors	Rank	(N)
Having a job and some counseling	1.5	(1,192)
Type of job assigrment	2.0	(1,198)
Supervisor-enrollee ratio	2.5	(1,206)

The respondents may be saying that all the youngsters are helped by the job, the pay and the counseling and that, for the most part, they think they have most success with the students who are in white collar and hospital jobs. If so, they may just be responding in typical American society categories, presuming that the youngsters in "better" jobs have a greater chance of success; or, brighter youngsters may have gravitated to these jobs, insuring greater success for the white collar category.

The data now being gathered for our study of the enrollees will help us resolve this problem. Yet the very way in which the project directors react to different job classifications gives us grounds to suspect that the enrollee's attitude to his job, and what he wants to get out of it, may be as important for enrollee success as the job itself. While a broad range of jobs may not be possible for many projects, attempts at job orientation by the project director and supervisor are always possible for any job. Only experience and study can settle the question.

At the request of the national NYC office, a question was added to the questionnaire soliciting the respondents' opinions about the effect of NYC upon the schools. The directors were asked whether the NYC program had had any impact on various services provided by the enrollees' schools. Table 8.7 shows almost three-quarters of the projects (71.9 per cent) report that teachers show a greater awareness of student problems; that almost half feel that there has been an increase in, or an improvement of, counseling services (49.5 per cent and 44.5 per cent, respectively); that a little more than one-third feel that NYC has brought about greater flexibility in class scheduling (36.8 per cent) and improvement in student orientation programs (38.5 per cent). The same table also reports an extraordinarily regular phenomenon: on every topic just mentioned, the larger the size of the project, the more likely is the project to report these favorable changes; also for every topic, and in every size category, proportionately more rural projects than urban projects report such changes. The regularity of

TABLE 8.7

PROJECT TYPE AND CHANGES IN SCHOOL BECAUSE OF NYC

(Per Cent "Yes" on Each Change)

Changes	Project Type							
	Small		Medium		Large		Mixed	Total
	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural		
Increase in counseling services	26.5 (79)	36.9 (311)	53.0 (245)	67.7 (192)	72.6 (139)	76.0 (138)	33.3 (63)	49.5 (1,167)
Improvement in counseling services	17.9 (78)	32.8 (304)	48.1 (243)	57.3 (190)	70.5 (139)	76.8 (138)	25.8 (62)	44.5 (1,154)
Curriculum changes	1.2 (78)	9.2 (303)	15.7 (242)	22.1 (185)	18.9 (132)	15.9 (60)	6.6 (60)	12.5 (1,132)
Flexibility in class scheduling	17.9 (78)	18.5 (307)	46.2 (242)	48.1 (187)	65.0 (140)	67.4 (135)	13.1 (61)	36.8 (1,150)
Greater teacher awareness of student problems	42.8 (84)	64.1 (329)	77.5 (249)	79.1 (197)	90.2 (142)	92.9 (142)	74.6 (63)	71.9 (1,207)
Improvement in student orientation programs	20.5 (78)	38.9 (313)	33.3 (246)	49.2 (191)	47.8 (138)	61.9 (134)	33.3 (63)	38.5 (1,163)
Introduction of student orientation programs	6.5 (76)	17.6 (300)	19.4 (236)	28.4 (176)	25.0 (136)	34.9 (126)	15.0 (60)	19.1 (1,110)

these two tendencies, and the size of the proportionate differences between large and small projects, is extraordinary. Most project directors believe the NYC program has had a favorable effect upon the schools, and the larger their projects, the more general the belief becomes among them.

There are several possible explanations for this phenomenon, none of which is empirically provable. The small projects may be in areas where there is less room for improvement, while the larger projects, more anonymous initially, had more chance to improve; but if this is so, why do small rural projects, surely less anonymous than small urban projects, show more improvement than the urban ones? And if the larger projects have more resources by which to improve themselves, why do large urban projects improve less than large rural ones, since cities normally have more resources for improvement than do rural areas? The idea that larger projects can have more of an impact on the schools than the small projects ordinarily do has some merit; but larger projects ordinarily are spread out over several or many schools, diffusing their force, and the school systems to which larger projects are attached are ordinarily much larger than are the systems to which small projects are attached. Consequently, we can find no compelling explanation for the spread of the data reported in Table 8.8. It takes us by surprise, and calls for careful analysis of the data from the enrollee study. Nonetheless, it is encouraging.

We have one means of analyzing the directors' statements about one aspect of NYC's effect on the schools. In Chapter V we explained the "Guidance Score" which was developed from the responses of the directors about the incidence and frequency of counseling and testing for the NYC enrollees. The important element here is that the Guidance Score is based upon what is done for the enrollees, not for the general student body. If the projects with a high Guidance Score report that NYC has helped to increase counseling services throughout the entire student body, and if this happens irrespective of Project Type, then we would have additional grounds for accepting the directors' opinions--

TABLE 8.8

EFFECT OF NYC ON SCHOOL COUNSELING SERVICES

(Per Cent of Schools Reporting Increase in Counseling As A Result of NYC, by Guidance Score and Project Type)

Guidance Score	Project Type						Mixed	Total
	Small		Medium		Large			
	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural		
Low (0-2) .	*	36.0	39.9	40.2	40.5	37.4	*	39.4
High (3-5)	*	64.0	59.9	59.5	59.2	61.3	*	60.6
Total .	*	100.0	99.8	99.7	99.7	98.7	*	100.0
(N) . .	(18)	(100)	(115)	(114)	(96)	(101)	(20)	(564)

N	564
No changes	332
Don't know	142
NA	219
Total	1,257

additional in the sense that what they say on an unrelated issue is congruent with what they say when asked directly if NYC has increased counseling facilities in the schools.

Table 8.8 presents these additional grounds for accepting the idea that NYC has increased counseling facilities in the schools, when NYC has a relatively good guidance program of its own. Thus, three-fifths (60.9 per cent) of all the schools which are high on the NYC Guidance Score, regardless of project size or urban-rural location, report that NYC has increased the school's general counseling facilities; only 39.4 per cent of the schools low on the NYC Guidance Score, again regardless of project size or urban-rural location, make the same report. An effect powerful enough to knock out normally expected urban-rural and project size differences is extraordinary indeed.

Why this should occur is not as clear as the fact that it does. But it looks as if exceptionally good guidance activity for NYC enrollees generates further guidance for the whole student body.

CHAPTER IX

CONCLUSION

To summarize a report like this one is difficult, for the report itself is a summary of project characteristics. So we shall content ourselves with restating what appear to be the most interesting findings of this report and indicating some of the questions they raise.

The different patterns of organization which we found in the regions are probably administrative responses to varied geographic, demographic, and economic situations. The fact that female enrollees are in the majority in the Northeast and Midwest is curious. Why is it so? Are the males otherwise employed? Or do they avoid the program? If the latter is the case in ghetto areas, one wonders what is being done to improve the occupational chances of the young males.

The Project Type Index proved to be a good tool for both summary and analysis, because it showed significant differences among projects--differences resulting from size and location in urban or in rural areas. Thus, enrollees in large urban projects have a wider range of NYC jobs open to them; these projects rely less on unskilled jobs to provide work for their enrollees, as do urban projects at each size level, compared to rural projects. One suspects, along with most of the project directors, that white-collar jobs are more closely related to program success--but are they? The enrollee study should provide an answer to that question.

Large urban projects report that NYC personnel do more of the recruiting than do school personnel, while the situation is reversed in rural projects. The assumption has been, among project directors, that personal recruitment, with the enrollee working with or for the person who recruited him, is most desirable. We can find out whether or not this is true from the enrollee study.

In general, the larger the project the more frequent is the counseling for the enrollee. But, regardless of size and urban-rural location, the better the NYC counseling, the greater the effect of NYC procedures on the schools. So size and location are by no means absolute determinants.

Again, the larger the project, the greater the tendency of projects to find federal funding for auxiliary services adequate; and a few more rural projects, at almost every size level, tend to be more satisfied than urban projects. Is this because more federal funds are allocated to them? Or that there are more resources surrounding the larger programs which they can apply more economically to their enrollees than can the smaller programs thus stretching the federal dollar further? Almost no large programs say that federal funding for these services is "irrelevant" to them, as many small projects do.

It seems clear that NYC is not simply duplicating services already offered by the schools, but is supplementing them, and, in many cases, improving the general school situation. However, the great majority of NYC programs depend on the schools and their basic resources as their own starting point. It seems that projects which are small, or are in rural areas, benefit proportionately less from the services potentially available through NYC. Another way of saying the same thing is that schools better off to begin with gain proportionately more through the NYC program--which is itself a variant of the hoary old principle: "Them what has, gets." Is differential funding possible?

APPENDIX A

TABLE A.1

DISTRIBUTION OF ALL ENROLLEES ACCORDING TO JOB CLASSIFICATION

Job Classification	Per Cent	Total
Academic Aide in Secondary School	20.8	20,880
Library Aide	7.2	7,768
Aides in Special Academic Programs	2.9	2,948
Office Aide	20.4	20,441
Hospital Aide	3.0	2,968
Service Aide	9.9	9,929
Aide for Unskilled Manual Work	27.7	27,763
Aide for Skilled or Semi-Skilled Manual Work. .	5.0	4,992
Other	2.6	2,580
Total	99.5	100,269*

*The discrepancy between this total (as well as the others like it in the next two tables) and the number of youngsters reported as being actually enrolled (102,468) is due to the fact that a few projects did not give the requested breakdowns.

TABLE A.2

DISTRIBUTION OF ALL ENROLLEES ACCORDING TO LOCATION OF WORK STATION

Work Station Location	Per Cent	Total
Public School	77.8	72,326
Private Nonsectarian School	.4	334
Religiously Affiliated School	3.9	3,636
Hospital	3.6	3,348
Federal Agency	1.8	1,682
State, County, Municipal Agency	6.2	5,795
Private Non-Profit Agency	5.3	4,919
Other	.9	879
Total	99.9	92,919

TABLE A.3

DISTRIBUTION OF ALL ENROLLEES ACCORDING TO SCHOOL GRADE LEVEL

Grade in School	Per Cent	Total
8th Grade or less	1.9	1,835
9th Grade	7.6	7,459
10th Grade	19.3	18,780
11th Grade	34.6	33,700
12th Grade	36.0	35,008
Other	.5	531
Total	99.9	97,313

APPENDIX B

SPONSORS' FORMS

Survey #512

National Opinion Research Center
University of Chicago
6030 South Ellis Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60637

FOR SPONSORS OF NYC IN-SCHOOL PROGRAMS BEGINNING, CONTINUING, OR RESUMING IN FALL, 1966

NOTE:

> If your Agency is NOT sponsoring or sub-sponsoring a Neighborhood Youth Corps IN-SCHOOL program this Fall, please check here ______, fill in your name and address below, and then simply return this questionnaire to us.

NOTE: For the purposes of this NORC study, a "Sponsor" is the Agency signing an NYC Project Agreement with the United States Department of Labor which deals, in whole or in part, with In-School NYC Enrollees.

A "Co- or Sub-Sponsor" is here considered to be an agency which runs its own portion of an In-School Program, and has its own Official responsible, with or under the Sponsor, for enrollee job assignment, recruitment, supportive service, and payroll.

Thus, the supervisor of a particular work site who is responsible only for on-the-job supervision of enrollees, even if he personally recruited them, is NOT to be considered a Co- or Sub-Sponsor. But a School Board, for instance, or a private non-profit agency funded through the Community Action Agency, or a municipal funding agency or the like, IS considered to be a Co- or Sub-Sponsor.

FOR ALL SPONSORS:

Name of Sponsoring Agency ______________________________

Name of Responsible Official ______________________________

Title of Responsible Official ______________________________

Address ______________________________
(number and street)

____
(city or town) (state) (zip code)

Your NYC Contract Number for 1966-67 (Fiscal '67):
(if you have no FY '67 number as yet, fill in
the number of your latest In-School contract.) ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

NOTE: If you, the Sponsor, do NOT directly administer a particular In-School Project yourself, but serve as the co-ordinator or the funding agent for co- or sub-sponsors, please

CHECK HERE __________

(Please use next page to list any additional co- or sub-sponsors)

IF YOU HAVE ONE OR MORE CO- OR SUB-SPONSORS, PLEASE LIST THEM:

1. Co- or Sub-Sponsoring Agency
Name of Responsible Official
Title of Responsible Official
Address
(number and street)
(city or town) (state) (zip code)

NYC Contract Number, if different from above: ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

2. Co- or Sub-Sponsoring Agency
Name of Responsible Official
Title of Responsible Official
Address
(number and street)
city or town) (state) (zip code)

NYC Contract Number, if different from above: ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

3. Co- or Sub-Sponsoring Agency
Name of Responsible Official
Title of Responsible Official
Address
(number and street)
(city or town) (state) (zip code)

NYC Contract Number, if different from above: ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

4. Co- or Sub-Sponsoring Agency
Name of Responsible Official
Title of Responsible Official
Address
(number and street)
(city or town) (state) (zip code)

NYC Contract Number, if different from above: ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

(If there are more than four Co- or Sub-Sponsors, please use additional sheet to list a ency, name, title, address, and project number as above.)

APPENDIX C

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS
WASHINGTON, D.C., 20210

December, 1966

Dear Sponsor:

May I again ask you to cooperate with us on a research project?

All of us want to know, as I am sure you do yourself, how well the Neighborhood Youth Corps' In-School Program is fulfilling the purposes for which it was instituted. We have contracted with the University of Chicago's National Opinion Research Center (NORC) to help us find out. All Project Directors for NYC in-school programs running this fall are receiving the attached questionnaire from NORC.

Since the only real measure of program success is NYC's effect upon the educational and occupational values of the enrollees, and then upon their behavior subsequent to termination, NORC has undertaken to study just that. The attached questionnaire is the data-gathering instrument for the first phase of the study.

There are two distinct purposes behind the questionnaire: fact gathering and opinion gathering. NORC needs to know some facts about all the in-school programs across the country to assure the validity of a national probability sample of enrollees which they will soon draw up. And NORC wants to get your opinions about various aspects of the program to make the enrollee study as practical and down-to-earth as possible.

Your cooperation with this study will help the people we are all trying to help: the youngsters enrolled in the NYC In-School Program. Please try to get the questionnaire back to NORC in one week's time. An envelope addressed to NORC is provided for you.

Sincerely yours,

Jack Howard

Jack Howard
Administrator

Enclosure:
Return envelope

norc
national opinion research center

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO · 6030 S. ELLIS AVE. · CHICAGO, ILL., 60637 · 312-684-5600
PETER H. ROSSI, director · RICHARD D. JAFFE, assistant director · PAUL B. SHEATSLEY, survey research service director

December, 1966

Project Director
In-School Program
Neighborhood Youth Corps

Dear Sir:

The questionnaire now before you is as economical as we could make it. By that we mean that our prime concern in designing it was to get the information we need at the least possible cost in time to you.

As Jack Howard indicates in his letter, your cooperation is crucial to the success of this study. We are going to draw a national sample of youngsters who are enrolled in in-school NYC programs, and we must make sure that we have a truly representative sample. That is the reason for the questions about enrollee numbers, job classifications, age, sex, work sites, etc.

Other factual questions--especially the ones concerning counseling, funding, and recruitment--are there to discover the range and magnitude of the difficulties faced by Project Directors in program administration. Let us assure you: there are no "sleepers" in this questionnaire, no purposes we are trying to hide. The whole thing is quite straightforward.

The questions which ask for your opinion about factors responsible for enrollee success are included for two reasons: first, we want to take advantage of your experience as we prepare the enrollee questionnaires; second, we think that no one is in a better position than yourself to judge the relative importance of these factors.

Please answer every question. Most can be answered by circling a number in the conventional response pattern. Some call for you to write in actual numbers, and a few ask you to rank items by writing in the figures 1, 2, 3, etc. Our effort here was always to choose a format which made it as easy as possible for you to answer the question.

One further point: all your answers are completely confidential. No one will single out your individual responses to this questionnaire. Rather, our interest is in overall projects and in NYC national programs.

Many thanks for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Charles Kamen
Charles Kamen
Assistant Study Director

RJ McNamara
Robert J. McNamara
Senior Study Director

EASTERN OFFICE: · 55 Fifth Avenue · New York, New York 10003 · Telephone: Algonquin 5-5290 · Area Code 212

TRUSTEES: D. Gale Johnson, Pres. · Frederick F. Stephan, Vice Pres. · Benjamin Bloom · James Coleman · James C. Downs, Jr. · Morris H. Hansen
Harry Kalven, Jr. · Nathan Keyfitz · Frederick Mosteller · Alfred C. Nelson · George P. Shultz · Don R. Swanson · W. Allen Wallis

Budget Bureau No. 44-R1328
Expires 6-30-68

512-S

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SPONSORS OR SUB-SPONSORS OF IN-SCHOOL NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS PROJECTS

If your Agency is NOT sponsoring or sub-sponsoring a Neighborhood Youth Corps IN-SCHOOL program this Fall, please check here______, fill in your name and address below, and then simply return this questionnaire to us.

Your NYC Contract Number for 1966-67 (Fiscal '67): ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐
(If you have no FY '67 number as yet, fill in the number of your latest In-School contract.)

SPONSORING OR SUB-SPONSORING AGENCY: (Fill in the name of the Agency which actually runs the NYC In-School Program, whether or not this Agency contracts directly and singly with NYC's national or regional office.)

Name of Agency: ________________________________

Name of Responsible Official: ________________________________

Title of Responsible Official: ________________________________

Address: ________________________________
(Number) (Street)

____
(City or Town) (State) (Zip Code)

GENERAL (or "UMBRELLA") SPONSOR: (Fill in the name of the Agency--if there is one --through or with which the above Agency contracts with NYC for its In-School Program.)

Name of Agency: ________________________________

Name of Responsible Official: ________________________________

Title of Responsible Offical: ________________________________

Address: ________________________________
(Number) (Street)

____
(City or Town) (State) (Zip Code)

We'd like to begin by asking you three general questions about your program.

1. What is the total number of in-school enrollees specified by the Neighborhood Youth Corps contract on which you are now operating?

_ ______

2. How many students are actually enrolled in your in-school program?

______

3. If you have not yet reached your full enrollment for the in-school program when do you expect to attain it?

Have already reached full enrollment . .	1
By January 1, 1967	2
By February 1, 1967	3
After March 1, 1967	4
I don't know	X

Next, we'd like to ask some questions about the kinds of enrollees you attract, and how you get them.

4. Do you get your in-school enrollees because some adult personally approached them or told you about them? Or do you get them through some less personal means--e.g., posters, announcements, general publicity?

Because an adult approached them or suggested them to you.	1	(TO #5)
Because of some less personal contact. .	2	(TO #6)
Both	3	(ANS.A)

IF BOTH: A. Do more of your in-school enrollees come because of personal contact with adults or do more come because of less personal communication?

More through adult personal contact. . .	4
More through less personal communication	5
About half and half.	6
I don't know	X

5. If you do get any in-school enrollees because some adult personally approached them or told you about them, please rank the sources listed below in the order of which person gets the most enrollees. Put a "1" after the sort of person who brings the most enrollees, a "2" after the sort who brings the next most, etc. If any kind of person listed below does not bring you any enrollees, put a zero after that source.

NYC Project Director or Project Staff . . ___

School personnel--e.g., teachers, principals, counselors, etc. . . . . ___

Clergy outside of school system . . . . . ___

Community center workers, settlement house workers, social workers . . . . ___

Other (SPECIFY)____________________ ___

I don't know . .(CIRCLE THE "X") X

---

6. If you do get any in-school enrollees through less personal communication, please rank the sources below in the order of which attracts the most enrollees. Put a "1" after the source from which you get the most, a "2" after the source from which you get the next most, etc. If there is any source from which you get no enrollees put a zero after it.

Signs and posters in school . . . . ___

Employment service . . . . ___

Announcements in school . . . . ___

Publicity in community centers, settlement houses, churches, etc. . . . . ___

Other (SPECIFY)____________________ ___

I don't know. .(CIRCLE THE "X"). X

---

7. Do you get any in-school enrollees mainly because their friends suggested NYC to them or encouraged them to enroll?

All or almost all of them	1
Most of them	2
About half of them	3
Less than half of them	4
Very few of them	5
I don't know.	X

8. Of necessity, in-school projects develop different procedures for recruitment. Some are able simply to recruit impoverished youngsters; others are able to recruit those impoverished youngsters whose records indicate additional problems: psychological, educational, disciplinary, etc. Still others are able to recruit both. Which of these procedures are you able to follow?

Simply recruit impoverished youngsters . . . . 1 (TO #9)
Recruit those with additional problems . . . . 2 (TO #9)
Recruit both . . . . 3 (ANS.A)

A. IF YOU RECRUIT BOTH KINDS of youngsters, about how many of them fall into the category of those having "additional problems"?

All or almost all of have additional problems 4
About three-fourths have additional problems 5
A little more than half have additional problems 6
About half have additional problems . . 7
A little less than half have additional problems 8
About one-fourth have additional problems 9
Few or none have additional problems . . 0

---

9. Do you have more students eligible for your in-school program than you are budgeted for, not enough students eligible, or is the number just about right?

More eligible students than budget allows . . . . 1 (ANS.A)
Fewer eligible students than budget allows . . . . 2 (TO #10)
Number of eligible students is just about right . . . . 3 (TO #10)

A. IF MORE ELIGIBLE THAN BUDGET ALLOWS: Have you tried to get more money to take care of the excess number of eligible students?

Yes . . . . 4 (ANS.[1])
No . . . . 5 (TO #10)

IF YES: [1] Have you been successful in your attempt?

Yes, whenever tried . . . 6
Yes, usually 7
Only rarely 8
Never 9

Here are some questions about counseling and testing.

10. Are students interested in applying for your in-school program able to apply and go through any necessary preliminary testing or counseling at one time and place? Or is more than one visit necessary for the application process?

All done in one session (except for information on family finances). . . .	1
Two sessions are required.	2
Three or more sessions are required. . .	3

---

11. Is professional counseling (other than testing) normally available to the students attending the schools from which your in-school enrollees are drawn?

Yes.	4	(ANS.A)
No	5	(TO #12)

IF YES: A. What kind? (CIRCLE AS MANY AS APPLY)

Vocational	6
Psychological.	7
Educational.	8
Other (SPECIFY) ____________ ______________________	9

---

12. Do your in-school enrollees, at or near the time of enrollment, get any professional counseling because of their enrollment in NYC, whether or not the school normally provides professional counseling for all its students?

Yes.	1	(ANS.A)
No	2	(TO #13)

IF YES: A. What kind? (CIRCLE AS MANY AS APPLY)

Vocational	3
Psychological.	4
Educational.	5
Other (SPECIFY)____________ ______________________	6

13. During their participation in the in-school program, do your enrollees receive professional counseling at regularly scheduled intervals, whether this counseling is provided by the school or the program?

Yes	1	(ANS.A&B)
No	2	(TO #14)

IF YES: A. How often?

At least weekly	3
Twice a month	4
Monthly	5
Every other month	6
Once a semester	7
Once a year	8

B. What kind of counseling? (CIRCLE AS MANY AS APPLY)

Vocational.	3
Educational	4
Psychological	5
Other (SPECIFY) ________ ________________________	6

---

14. Is professional counseling available for in-school enrollees in the event of special problems?

Yes	1
No.	2

15. If an in-school enrollee asks to see a counselor, can he get to see him within, at most, two days?

Yes, always	3
Usually	4
In about half the cases . .	5
Seldom	6
Never	7

---

16. During their participation in the NYC program, are any tests administered to your in-school enrollees which the school does not normally administer to its students?

Yes	1	(ANS.A)
No	2	(TO #17)

IF YES: A. What kind? (CIRCLE AS MANY AS APPLY)

Achievement	3
Intelligence	4
Aptitude	5
Psychological	6
Vocational	7
Other (SPECIFY)____________	8

---

17. Do in-school enrollees normally receive termination interviews--

--if they leave when the program terminates?

All or almost all do . . .	1
Most do	2
About half do	3
Almost half do	4
About a quarter do	5
Few or none do	6

--if they leave the program before it terminates?

All or almost all do . . .	4
Most do	5
About half do	6
Almost half do	7
About a quarter do	8
Few or none do	9

18. Does the NYC Project Director or the school have a set procedure for ascertaining the plans of in-school enrollees who are graduating from high school?

Yes, the school does . . .	6
Yes, the NYC does	7
Yes, both do	8
There is no set procedure .	9

---

19. Does the NYC Project Director or the school normally help to find jobs for those enrollees who are graduating from high school and entering the labor force?

Yes, the school does . . .	1
Yes, NYC does	2
Yes, both do	3
No, neither does.	4
There is no set procedure .	5

Now we'd like to ask you about some financial aspects of your program.

20. Are your in-school enrollees all paid at the same hourly rate?

Yes	1	(TO #21)
No	2	(ANS. A)

IF NO: A. What accounts for the differences?

CIRCLE AS MANY AS APPLY

Enrollees can receive raises	6
Different rates for different jobs	7
Enrollee needs are taken into consideration	8
Other (SPECIFY) ______________________	9

---

21. What is the average hourly wage for your in-school enrollees?

$0.99 per hour or less . .	1
1.00 -$1.09 per hour . . .	2
1.10 - 1.19 per hour . . .	3
1.20 - 1.29 per hour . . .	4
1.30 - 1.39 per hour . . .	5
1.40 - 1.49 per hour . . .	6
1.50 per hour or more . .	7

22. Do you find it difficult to attract or retain in-school enrollees at your present wage level?

No, it is not difficult to attract and retain enrollees	1
Not difficult to attract, but difficult to retain enrollees	2
Difficult to attract, but not difficult to retain enrollees	3
Difficult both to attract and retain enrollees	4

23. Do you consider your hourly wage rate too high to run a successful in-school program, too low, or just about right?

Too high	5
Too low	6
Just about right	7

24. How often are your in-school enrollees scheduled to be paid?

Weekly	0
Every other week	1
Twice a month	2
Monthly	3
Other (SPECIFY)____________	4

25. How do your in-school enrollees receive their pay?

By mail	5
From work-station supervisors, on the job	6
From sponsor, on the job	7
From sponsor, at central administration center	8
Other (SPECIFY) ______________________	9

26. Have you encountered much difficulty in meeting your in-school payroll on time?

Yes, frequently	1	(ANS. A)
Yes, sometimes	2	(ANS. A)
Only rarely	3	(ANS. A)
Never	4	(TO #27)

A. IF YOU HAVE ENCOUNTERED DIFFICULTY: Where is its source?

CIRCLE AS MANY AS APPLY

NYC or OEO Washington Office	5
Difficulty centers in an intermediate agency, whether state, municipal, or Community Action Agency	6
Difficulty within the sponsoring, or subsponsoring agency itself	7
Difficulty with NYC Regional Office	8

---

27. Do you receive the funds for your in-school program directly from NYC or OEO, or from some other source?

Funds come directly from NYC or OEO	1
Funds come through public community action agency or program	2
Funds come through state, county, or municipal agency other than a community action agency	3
Funds come through a private community action agency	4

---

28. Because of different local problems and practices, various Neighborhood Youth Corps in-school projects find certain aspects of federal funding inadequate. Please indicate how you have found the adequacy of federal funding for the parts of the program listed below.

CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH PART OF THE PROGRAM

	Adequate	Inadequate	Irrelevant For Me
Administration	1	2	3
Counseling	4	5	6
Testing	7	8	9
Office supplies	1	2	3
Transportation	4	5	6

Here are some questions about the activities of the Project Director, of any staff he may have, and of the work-station supervisors.

29. How often is the Project Director himself able to visit the work-stations for the in-school project? (We do not mean EACH work station--but how often can he get out to visit work-stations?)

Daily or almost daily . . .	1
More than once a week . . .	2
Once a week	3
Every other week	4
Once a month	5
Once or twice a semester .	6
Less than that	7
Never	8

---

30. How often does a member (or members) of the Project Director's staff visit work-stations?

By staff is meant an assistant to the Project Director or a Counselor specially responsible to the Project Director.

Daily or almost daily . . .	1
More than once a week . . .	2
Once a week	3
Every other week	4
Once a month	5
Once or twice a semester .	6
Less than that	7
Never	8
No staff for this purpose .	9

---

31. How often does the Project Director himself get to visit EACH work-station? (This can vary, we know; but, on the average, how often?)

More than once a week . . .	1
About once a week	2
About once every two weeks	3
About once a month	4
About once or twice a semester	5
About once a year	6
Never	7

32. How often is EACH work-station visited by a member of Project Director's staff? Again, we know this can vary; but, on the average, how often?

By staff is meant an assistant to the Project Director or a Counselor specially responsible to the Project Director

More than once a week . . .	0
Once a week	1
About once every two weeks	2
About once a month	3
About once or twice a semester	4
About once a year	5
Never	6
No staff for this purpose .	7

---

33. Is your Project Director also Project Director for an Out-of-School NYC program?

Yes	8
No	9

---

34. How many persons are serving in your program as work-station supervisors for in-school NYC enrollees?

____

---

35. How many of these supervisors normally supervise --

Please check the sum of these four figures. It should equal the figure you gave for Q.34

-- 1 to 3 enrollees	______
-- 4 to 6 enrollees	______
-- 7 to 9 enrollees	______
-- 10 or more enrollees . . .	______

---

36. Do work-station supervisors ever supervise enrollees for whose application they were themselves responsible?

Yes	1 (ANS.A)
No	2 (TO #37)

IF YES: A. For how many supervisors is this now true?

All or almost all	3
Most	4
A little more than half . .	5
About half	6
A little less than half . .	7
Only a few	8

37. Are work-station supervisors paid extra for supervising the NYC in-school enrollees or is their supervisory work considered part of their regular job and covered by their regular salary?

All are paid extra for supervision	1
Most are paid extra for supervision . . .	2
Some are paid extra for supervision . . .	3
None is paid extra for supervision . . .	4

---

38. On the average, how often is the Project Director, his assistant, or a counselor specially responsible to him, in personal contact (face-to-face or extended phone conversation) with the individual work-station supervisor about NYC activities?

At least several times a week	5
About once a week	6
About once every two weeks	7
About once a month	8
Less than that	9

---

39. How do people become work-station supervisors for your in-school program?

A. For stations located within the school system:

More often, the Project Director recruits potential supervisors	1
More often, the Project Director is approached by potential supervisors . .	2
About half-and-half	3

B. For stations located outside the school system (but for in-school enrollees):

More often, the Project Director recruits potential supervisors	4
More often, the Project Director is approached by potential supervisors . .	5
About half-and-half	6

The number of enrollees per supervisor, type of job assignment, and the simple fact of holding a job for which the enrollee receives pay--all these are considered important for success in the NYC in-school program.

By success we mean helping the enrollees to stay in school and get better marks as well as stirring up their interest in school and future occupation.

We would like you to tell us what you think of the general and relative importance of these three factors from your own experience as a sponsor.

40. Do you find that the smaller the number of in-school enrollees per supervisor, the greater is the likelihood of enrollee success? (CIRCLE ONLY ONE NUMBER)

Yes, always.	1
Yes, as a general rule	2
Too dependent on job-assignment to make a general statement	3
Makes no real difference	4
I think that too small a group decreases the likelihood of success.	5
No opinion	X

---

41. In regard to enrollee success in the in-school program: How important a factor is the type of job to which the enrollee is assigned?

Very important	6
Fairly important	7
Makes little or no difference. . . .	8
Don't know	X

42. Please rate the following general job classifications in terms of their association with enrollee success, as you see it, in the in-school program. (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH CATEGORY)

We do NOT mean that there are some job categories in which success is impossible or even unlikely. But in what job categories do you find the greatest incidence of enrollee success?

(NOTE: These categories are described in Q. 51)	Closely Associated with Success	Somewhat Associated with Success	Little or No Association with Success	I Don't Know
a. Academic aides in secondary schools. . . .	1	2	3	X
b. Library aides, regardless of work-station location	4	5	6	X
c. Aides in special academic programs--e.g., Head Start, remedial education. . . .	7	8	9	X
d. Office aides, regardless of work-station location.	1	2	3	X
e. Hospital aides.	4	5	6	X
f. Service aides	7	8	9	X
g. Aides for unskilled manual labor	1	2	3	X
h. Aides for skilled or semi-skilled manual work . . .	4	5	6	X

43. Do you find that, regardless of job classification and supervisor-enrollee ratio, the simple fact that the in-school enrollees have jobs, pay, and at least some counseling contributes as much as anything else to program success?

Yes.	1
No	2
No opinion	X

44. Now that you have expressed your opinion on the general importance of these factors, would you please rate their relative importance for enrollee success, as you see it? Put a "1" after the factor you consider to be most important, a "2" next to the factor you consider to be next most important, and a "3" next to the factor you consider third most important.

Supervisor-enrollee ratio . . . . ___

Type of job assignment . . . . ___

The fact of having a job and some counseling . . . . ___

Finally, we have to ask you some questions about the characteristics of your enrollees. We know that you have already answered some of them for NYC's national office and that you will have to go digging into your records to answer some of them. But the cross-tabulation of a large amount of data, and the fact that we are also doing a study of 4,000 in-school enrollees on a national-sample basis, demand that these data be collated in one place for computer analysis. So, please bear with us.

45. Approximately what proportion of your in-school enrollees are male?

None of them is	3
One-third or less	4
Slightly less than half	5
About half	6
Slightly more than half	7
About two-thirds	8
More than two-thirds	9
All of them are	0

---

46. About what proportion of your in-school enrollees are from 19 to 21 years of age?

One-tenth or less	1
About one-fifth	2
About one-third	3
A little less than half	4
About half	5
More than half	6

47. Do you feel that these 19-to-21 year old enrollees can be placed in job assignments in the same way as the younger enrollees?

Yes	7
No	8
Not sure	X

---

48. Do 10 percent or more of your in-school enrollees regularly work less than ten hours per week?

Yes	4 (ANS.A)
No	5 (TO #49)

IF YES: A. Please state the main reason or reasons.

---

49. Approximately what proportion of your in-school enrollees regularly work the maximum number of hours per week allowed by law?

All or almost all	3
About three-quarters	4
A little more than half	5
About half	6
A little less than half	7
About one-quarter	8
Very few or none	9

---

50. Approximately what proportion of your in-school enrollees regularly work from ten to fourteen hours per week?

All or almost all	1 (ANS.A)
About three-quarters	2 (ANS.A)
A little more than half	3 (ANS.A)
About half	4 (ANS.A)
A little less than half	5 (ANS.A)
About one-quarter	6 (TO #51)
Very few or none	7 (TO #51)

A. IF MORE THAN ONE-QUARTER work from ten to fourteen hours per week, state the main reason or reasons why they do not work fifteen hours.

51. **How many of your in-school enrollees are employed in each of the** following **job classifications?**

A. **Academic aides in secondary schools--e.g., aides for teachers, laboratory aides, tutoring aides, audio-visual aides, art aides, etc.** . . . . ______

B. Library aides, regardless of work-stations . . . . ______

C. Aides in special academic programs--e.g., pre-school (Head Start), remedial education, nursery school, etc. ______

D. Office aides--e.g., clerical, secretarial, general, etc., regardless of work site . . . . ______

E. Hospital aides . . . . ______

F. Service aides--e.g., stockroom aides, school monitors, food preparation aides, bus drivers' assistants, etc. . . . . ______

G. Aides for unskilled manual work--e.g., custodial, janitorial, cafeteria clean-up, groundskeeper, etc. . ______

H. Aides for skilled or semi-skilled manual work--e.g., carpentry, plumbing, machine shops, etc. . . . . ______

I. Other (SPECIFY) ______________________________

______________________________ ______

Total ______

(TOTAL SHOULD EQUAL FIGURE IN Q.2)

---

52. How many of your in-school enrollees are employed at work stations in the following agencies?

	Number
Public schools	______
Private non-sectarian schools . . .	______
Private religiously affiliated schools	______
Hospitals of any type	______
Federal agencies	______
State, county, or municipal agencies other than schools	______
Private, non-profit agencies other than schools whether or not religiously affiliated	______
Other (SPECIFY) ______________	
______________________________	______
Total	______

53. How many of your in-school enrollees are in each of the following grades?

	Number
8th grade or less	_____
9th grade	_____
10th grade	_____
11th grade	_____
12th grade	_____
Other (SPECIFY) __________________	
______________________________	_____
Total . . .	_____

---

54. What is the proportion of whites among your in-school enrollees? (Please count American Indians as nonwhite.)

All the enrollees are white . .	1
Almost all are white	2
More than half are white . . .	3
About half are white	4
Less than half are white . . .	5
Almost no one is white	6
None is white	7

---

55. What proportion of your in-school enrollees come from homes in which English is the regularly and fluently spoken language?

All or almost all do	1
About two-thirds do	2
About half do	3
About one-third do	4
None or almost none	5

---

56. Did your agency run an in-school NYC project during the last (1965-66) academic year?

Yes	6
No	7

24

57. As far as you can judge, has your in-school NYC program helped to bring about any general changes -- like the following -- in your school or schools?

	Yes	No	I don't know
A. An increase in counseling services?	1	2	X
B. Improvement in counseling services?	3	4	X
C. Any curriculum changes?	1	2	X
D. Flexibility in class scheduling?	3	4	X
E. Greater awareness among teachers of the students' problems?	1	2	X
F. Improvement in student orientation programs?	3	4	X
G. Introduction of student orientation programs?	1	2	X
H. Other (SPECIFY) ________________ ______________________________	1		

Name of person filling out questionnaire: ______________________________

Position: ______________________________

Phone Number: ______________________________
(Area Code) (Exchange) - (Number)

Many thanks for your cooperation. We shall welcome any comments you may care to make either on your NYC in-school program in general or on this questionnaire. Please put them in the space below.